The Journal of Historical Review

Volume 15, Number 1 January / February 1995

Revelations from Goebbels' Diary
David Irving

Goebbel's Place in History
Mark Weber

Holocaust Polls Show Bias
Greg Raven

Mysterious Collapse of an Egyptian Civilization
Revilo P. Oliver

French Weekly Acknowledges Gas Chamber Fraud

Revisionist Book Banned in Germany

Estonia: Emerging from Communism
Yuri N. Maltsev

— Reviews —

Clausen and Lee's Pearl Harbor: Final Judgement
James J. Martin

John Maynard Keynes: Revisionist
Andrew Gray

— And More —

Advance TO Barbarism

THE DEVELOPMENT OF TOTAL WARFARE

F.J.P. Veale

In this eloquent and provocative work, an English attorney with a profound understanding of military history traces the evolution of warfare from primitive savagery to the rise of a "civilized" code that was first threatened in our own Civil War, again in the First World War, and finally shattered during the Second World War—the most destructive conflict in history.

As the author compellingly argues, the ensuing "War Crimes Trials" at Nuremberg and Tokyo, and their more numerous and barbaric imitations in Communist-controlled eastern Europe, established the perilous principle that "the most serious war crime is to be on the losing side."

Out of print for many years, this classic work of revisionist history—a moving denunciation of hate-propaganda and barbarism—is once again available in a well-referenced new edition with a detailed index.



CRITICAL PRAISE FOR *ADVANCE TO BARBARISM:*

This is a relentlessly truth speaking book. The truths it speaks are bitter, but of paramount importance if civilization is to survive. —MAX EASTMAN

I have read the book with deep interest and enthusiasm. It is original in its approach to modern warfare, cogent and convincing... His indictment of modern warfare and post-war trials must stand. —NORMAN THOMAS

The best general book on the Nuremberg Trials. It not only reveals the illegality, fundamental immorality and hypocrisy of these trials, but also shows how they are bound to make any future world wars (or any important wars) far more brutal and destructive to life and property. A very readable and impressive volume and a major contribution to any rational peace movement. —HARRY ELMER BARNES

. . .Indispensable to earnest students of the nature and effects of warfare. It contains trenchant criticisms of the Nuremberg trials, and it exposes the stupidities of 'peace-loving' politicians. —FRANCIS NEILSON

. . .A very outstanding book... —GENERAL J.F.C. FULLER

This is a book of great importance. Displaying the rare combination of a deep knowledge of military history and an acute legal insight, it is a brilliant and courageous exposition of the case for civilization. —CAPTAIN RUSSELL GRENFELL

ADVANCE TO BARBARISM
Quality Softcover · 363 pages
$11.00 + $2.00 postage
from Institute for Historical Review
P.O. Box 2739 · Newport Beach, CA 92659

Editor: Mark Weber

Associate Editor: Greg Raven

EDITORIAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Advisors are not spokespersons of
the educational institutions identified.

GEORGE ASHLEY, Ph.D
Los Angeles Unified School District (Ret.)

ENRIQUE AYNAT, L.L.B.
Torreblanca, Spain

PHILIP BARKER, Ph.D
Minneapolis, Minnesota

JOHN BENNETT, L.L.B.
Australian Civil Liberties Union
Melbourne, Australia

FRIEDRICH P. BERG, B.Sc.
Ft. Lee, New Jersey

ALEXANDER V. BERKIS, L.L.M., Ph.D.
Professor of History (Ret.)
Longwood College
Farmville, Virginia

ARTHUR R. BUTZ, Ph.D.
Associate Professor of
Electrical Engineering & Computer Science
Northwestern University
Evanston, Illinois

BOYD CATHEY, Ph.D.
The Southern Partisan
Columbia, South Carolina

ROBERT H. COUNTESS, Ph.D.
Huntsville, Alabama

ALBERT J. ECKSTEIN, Ph.D.
Private Research Consultant

ROBERT FAURISSON, Ph.D.
University of Lyon-2
Lyon, France

GEORG FRANZ-WILLING, Ph.D.
Überlingen, Germany

SAMUEL EDWARD KONKIN III
Long Beach, California

R. CLARENCE LANG, Ph.D., M. Div.
Seguin, Texas

JAMES MARTIN, Ph.D.
Colorado Springs, Colorado

CARLO MATTOGNO
Rome, Italy

HIDEO MIKI
Professor of History (Ret.)
National Defense Academy
Yokosuka, Japan

HENRI ROQUES, Ph.D.
Colombes, France

WILHELM STÄGLICH, Dr. Jur.
Glücksburg, Germany

UDO WALENDY, Diplo. Pol.
Vlotho/Weser, Germany

CHARLES E. WEBER, Ph.D.
Head, Dept. of Modern Languages (Ret.)
University of Tulsa
Tulsa, Oklahoma

The Journal of Historical Review

Volume 15, Number 1 January / February 1995

IN THIS ISSUE

Revelations from Goebbels' Diary 2
David Irving

Goebbels' Place in History 18
Mark Weber

French Magazine Acknowledges Auschwitz Gas Chamber Fraud 23

Major Holocaust Polls Show Built-In Bias 25
Greg Raven

Book Detailing Jewish Crimes Against Germans Banned 28

My Confrontation with Deborah Lipstadt 28
David Irving

Mattogno's New IHR Book Promoted on Radio Show 30

Canadian Police Destroy Revisionist Book 31

Murder of Jews a Crime in the Third Reich 32

Punishment for Mistreating SS Camp Prisoners 33

Why Did a Great Egyptian Civilization Suddenly Collapse? 34
Revilo P. Oliver

Estonia: Emerging From Communism 37
Yuri N. Maltsev

Clausen and Lee's *Pearl Harbor: Final Judgement* 39
A Review by James J. Martin

Keynes: Revisionist Thinker 44
A Review by Andrew Gray

Germany's Place in Post-Postwar Europe 45
A Review by Andrew Gray

Letters 47

On the Cover:
Goebbels at his imposing desk in the Propaganda Ministry in Berlin.

The Journal of Historical Review (ISSN: 0195-6752) began publication in 1980. It upholds and continues the tradition of Historical Revisionism of scholars such as Harry Elmer Barnes, A.J.P. Taylor, William H. Chamberlin, Paul Rassinier and Charles Tansill. *The Journal of Historical Review* is published six times yearly by the **Institute for Historical Review**, P.O. Box 4296, Torrance, CA 90510, USA. Subscription price: $40 per year, $65 for two years, and $90 for three years. For foreign subscriptions, add $10 per year. For overseas airmail delivery, add $30 per year. Remittances for subscriptions must be payable in US dollars drawable on a US bank.

Single issues — Spring 1986 (Volume 7) to the present — are available for sale for $7.50 each, plus $1.05 shipping. Back issues of the *Journal* are also available for purchase in hardbound annual volumes for the years 1984, 1985, 1986, 1988, 1989, 1990, 1991 and 1992, for $35.00 each. Please write for our booklist and prices. Quantity subscription and bulk issue rates are available upon request.

Appropriate manuscripts are welcomed by the Editor. They should be double-spaced and accompanied by return postage. Especially welcome are submissions on IBM-compatible or Macintosh computer diskette. Address all correspondence to P.O. Box 2739, Newport Beach, CA 92659. E-mail to: greg.ihr@kaiwan.com.

The Journal of Historical Review is listed in standard periodical directories, and is a member of the Conference of Historical Journals. Contributions do not necessarily reflect the views of the Institute for Historical Review.

All rights reserved. Except for specifically copyrighted items, permission is hereby given to reprint material from this issue of the *Journal*, provided that no changes or alterations are made without prior arrangement, and providing that the following attribution appears with the material: "Reprinted from *The Journal of Historical Review*, P.O. Box 2739, Newport Beach, CA 92659, USA. Subscriptions: $40 per year (domestic)." A copy of the reprint should be sent to the Editor.

Goebbels and the 'Final Solution'

Revelations from Goebbels' Diary

Bringing to Light Secrets of Hitler's Propaganda Minister

David Irving

At the last IHR Conference, in October 1992, I spoke about my visit to the secret Soviet state archives in Moscow, where I found the private diary of Dr. Joseph Goebbels, the Nazi Propaganda Minister, microfilmed on eighteen hundred glass plates. [See: D. Irving, "The Suppressed Eichmann and Goebbels Papers," March–April 1993 *Journal*, pp. 14–25.]

I can't tell you just who tipped me off about this, as it would breach confidentiality, but there are certain German historians who are friendly to me, and one of them tipped me that the material was just waiting to be found by someone. I went to Moscow and got this material — to the unbounded rage of rival historians around the world, who couldn't believe that I, the "incorrigible," "neo-Nazi," "Fascist-scum" historian, had got the stuff for which they had been looking for 50 years.

If you're a historian dealing with the Third Reich, you know that Goebbels' diary must contain all the dirt from that era. And yet, all the vital episodes of Third Reich history, the events we're really curious about — such as the June 1934 "Night of the Long Knives," when Hitler ditched SA Brown Shirt leader Ernst Röhm, or the "Crystal Night" in November 1938, or the Reichstag fire mystery, or the inside story of the rise of the Nazi Party — are missing from the *published* Goebbels diary, the portion that has been in the public domain for the last 40 years or so.

One way and another, portions have trickled out. First of all there was the original typed Goebbels diary for parts of the years 1942 and 1943, which is now in the Hoover Institution library in Stanford, California. [Edited by Louis Lochner, it was published in 1948.] The National Archives in Washington acquired a sheaf of diary pages from August 1941. The French somehow got April 1943, and the Hoover library obtained six diary pages from July 1944.

Most importantly, the Institute for Contemporary History in Munich managed to get hold of further portions of the diary through negotiations with the East German Communist authorities. [See, for example, *Final Entries 1945: The Diaries of Joseph Goebbels*. New York: 1978.]

But vital passages were missing even from these, among them the year 1944 — the year of D-Day, the Stauffenberg bomb plot, and the Battle of the Bulge. And there were years for which only a couple of notebooks have hitherto been available. One begins to suspect that somebody knew they were sitting on a real treasure, and they weren't going to release it. By holding back the good stuff, they were acting in an almost capitalistic manner.

In the end, I didn't pay one bent nickel for this material. Visiting Moscow in June 1992, I simply reminded the head of the Soviet state archives that over the years three or four of my books had been published in the former Soviet Union, and he just let me have the material, assuming, I suppose, that I was therefore kosher.

It was a different situation when I returned for the second time in July 1992 to complete the work. As the week progressed, I found it getting stickier and stickier. They suddenly weren't able to find the boxes and files I'd seen the time before. I had to fight and plead and holler, and they still weren't turning up the stuff I really wanted. On the last day, the secretary of the director came out to me and said: "Mr. Irving, I've got a very embarrassing question to ask of you. Have you been stealing any material from our archives?"

Now, this is something that a historian just doesn't do. When you work in the archives, you're working on trust. You've an obligation to posterity. You do not permanently remove stuff. I did, however, have an arrangement with the director, who permitted me to remove certain glass plates from

---

David Irving is one of the world's most widely read and influential historians. He is the author of more than two dozen published works on 20th century history. For more about him, see the Jan.–Feb. 1993 *Journal*, pp. 4–19. This essay is adapted from Irving's presentation at the Twelfth IHR Conference, Sept. 1994. Several of the illustrations appearing here are from Irving's forthcoming biography, *Dr. Goebbels: His Life and Death*, scheduled for publication later this year in New York, London, Stockholm, Tokyo, Paris and Milan.

the archives for copying because they didn't have the requisite facilities there. They didn't even have a microfiche reader. He allowed me to remove these glass plates on my honor, and bring them back after having made the necessary photographic prints.

In an effort to stop me from gaining access, it turned out that somebody had told the archives that I was stealing material. To resolve the situation I signed a declaration stating that everything I had seen in the archives was still there, and that nothing was missing. That was, in fact, the truth.

The archives director was very pleased to have this declaration, and the secretary added the pregnant words: "The information came from Munich." Once again my traditional enemies around the world were trying to trip me up. It didn't work because by that time I'd obtained 99 percent of the material I had on my "shopping list": diary portions dealing with the *Kristallnacht*, the "Night of the Long Knives," the Reichstag fire, Pearl Harbor, all of 1944, the whole of the months leading up to the outbreak of World War Two — everything. I'd gotten the lot.

It was difficult, because, as I said, the Russians didn't have a microfiche reader. I suspected in advance that I might need one, because in preparation for my trip to Moscow in the 1970s I had brought with me toilet paper and a bath plug because I knew I wouldn't find them in my Moscow hotel. On this occasion I had thought to myself, "Suppose — it's incredible, I mean this is a state archives — but just suppose they don't have a microfiche reader. I'd better take something with me." So I went to Selfridge's and asked for the most powerful magnifying glass they had. What I didn't know was that the more powerful the magnification, the smaller the lens is. I wound up buying a 12x magnifier that was about as big as my little fingernail. So during the first week I was there, I had to hold it up like this to read those glass plates. But if you don't mind straining your eyesight, it works.

It's quite an unusual feeling looking at the original Nazi microfiche glass plates in the original Agfa boxes — there are eighteen hundred plates, each with 25 or 40 images on them — a total of 70 or 80 thousand pages of paper. And you know you are the first person to read them since Goebbels, in 1944 and 1945, ordered the stuff to be preserved in case of damage to the originals. No one knows now where his original notebooks are, or what happened to them. They're probably gone forever. But fortunately they were preserved on glass plates, and I was the first person to study them.

The Reichstag Fire

For example, I read for the first time Goebbels' hand-written entry about the Reichstag fire. As he described it, he was at his home with Hitler on that evening of February 27, 1933, when the phone rang at nine o'clock. It was the prankster "Putzi" Hanfstaengl, saying: "The Reichstag's on fire." Goebbels remembered that he'd been had twice by Hanfstaengl already that week, and he thought this was another prank, so he just put the phone down. Hanfstaengl phoned again and said, "You'd better listen to what I'm saying, The Reichstag's on fire." Goebbels realized this could be serious after all, so he made a phone call to the police station at the Brandenburg Gate, which confirmed that the Reichstag was on fire. Thereupon he and Hitler jumped into a car and drove straight to the Reichstag where they found their worst fears confirmed. This is in the hand-written diary, it is obviously genuine, and it confirms what we know from other sources.

Dr. Goebbels, in an official portrait. (Courtesy of David Irving, from his forthcoming biography, *Dr. Goebbels: His Life and Death.*)

Early Entries

Goebbels' diary didn't start in 1933 when the Nazis come to power; it started when he was a student at Heidelberg University, and carries on all the way until a few days before he commits suicide in 1945 with his family in Hitler's bunker. Never has there been such a contiguous source of information for historians to use, but never has there been a source more fraught with danger. Nobody's diary is genuine, because everybody lies to his diary. Okay,

"lie" is a bit sharp. Everyone is a hero in his own diary. So what do you believe? That's the way it is with diaries. You've got to know how to evaluate them. What Goebbels writes in his diary about Goebbels, you treat with suspicion. What Goebbels writes in his diary about a fight between Rosenberg and Koch is probably more accurate, although he's got his sympathies there, too. You have to learn to be very careful.

I'm saying this for a reason, because when we come to look at what the diary says about the Crystal Night, it's not what you expect it to say, and you can only really straighten things out when you accept that Goebbels has his reasons for writing things in a certain way. I'm something of an expert with diaries, because I've been looking at people's diaries as an historian for the last 30 or 40 years, and I know the things to look for.

David Irving speaking at the Twelfth IHR Conference (Sept. 1994).

It always amuses me the way people write in their diaries certain euphemisms for relations with the opposite sex. I won't describe to you which words I use in my diary, but — okay, I will. I might write, "Lucy came 'round, and was amiable." It seems pretty harmless, but it's code. This becomes obvious if you slip up and write, "Lucy came round and was amiable twice."

I had the private diary of Luftwaffe Field Marshal Erhard Milch, who had the habit of putting a little X on the line between two days in his diary. Some days, however, there were two Xs, and on one occasion, during the battle of Stalingrad when he was in Berlin, there were three Xs followed by the initials "E.H.," all done into a kind of monogram or logo: "XXX E.H." I happened to know that "E.H." was Edith Hesselbarth, his private secretary. When I tracked her down at her home on Lake Constance, she was most indignant about this imputation, until I told her that Milch had written it in his diary, whereupon she confessed.

In the case of Dr. Goebbels, everybody knows that he has gone into history as the arch-Casanova of the Third Reich. He was the one with the string of amours, and no film starlet could make headway in the German film industry, so legend has it, without using the Minister's casting couch. And yet, it turns out, unless I'm grievously wrong, he was age 33 when he first had a sexual experience with a woman. If you read his diary you could be misled. Very early on in his diary, he's talking about how Else came 'round, and she was all his: "She was all over me." It's an imprecise phrase, but you're willing to believe, given his reputation, that this could only mean one thing.

In another passage, Anka Stalherm, the great heroine of his life, comes to see him and there's an episode on the meadow in Freiburg: "the first kiss." It's only when you start reading through the diary, and the letters that pass between her and Goebbels over the next ten years, that you realize that that first kiss was, in fact, a kiss on the cheek. That's as far as he got with her.

I subsequently found Anka Stalherm's daughter. Because I thought it would be a bit embarrassing to ask her how far her mother had gone with the Nazi Propaganda Minister, I planned on making this my last question before I beat a retreat. As I walked in through the door, though, she said: "Mr. Irving, before you even begin this interview, I want you to know what my mother told me about Goebbels, which is that she never, ever, did it with him. She found him intellectually fascinating, a man of enormous presence, but physically repulsive." Goebbels was 5'4", just over 100 pounds, a club foot with one leg two inches shorter than the other — a bit of a freak, in other words. He never got anywhere with Anka Stalherm, although if you read his diary you would imagine that she was the great love of his life.

How do we know he was 33 when it first happened? The answer is that he started going out with Olga, the girlfriend of Mr. Arnolt Bronner. (He had a predilection for dating other men's girlfriends; a dangerous habit if you're only 5'4".) He went out

with this woman, and she comes 'round, so to speak. Obviously something happened because that night he writes in his diary all the words of euphoria followed with the figures in parenthesis: "(1, 2)." This might, by itself, mean nothing at all, were it not for an entry a few days later, with Olga coming 'round again, and new figures in brackets: "(3, 4, 5)." Well this is rather like being "twice amiable," isn't it? It's a bit of a give-away, and given what we know about the kiss on the cheek, which was all he'd gotten in previous years, you can be pretty certain what this denotes. This happened in December 1930, and he was born in October 1897.

She is only one step ahead, so to speak, of Magda Quandt, who later became Magda Goebbels — the divorced, blonde, well-to-do wife of a German industrialist, who fell for him. In mid-February 1931 — after many, many weeks of working for him in the archives and so on — she comes 'round to his apartment, and you get the same brackets treatment. It's "(1)", and then "(2)", "(3)", and then, on March 1931, "(4)" and "(5)". Five episodes spread over six weeks. There again, you've got a certain amount of support for the belief that he wasn't as active as he made out in later years. If there was anything he was good at, it was propaganda. So we're demolishing a bit of a propaganda legend in connection with Dr. Goebbels here. Amusing as this is, it helps to teach us to be very cautious when dealing with someone's diary as a source of information.

Dr. Bernhard Weiss, Deputy Police Chief of Berlin in the years before the National Socialists came to power. Goebbels mockingly dubbed him "Isidor," a nickname meant to underscore his Jewish ancestry. (Photo: Bundesarchiv, Koblenz.)

Growing Anti-Semitism

I've gone through the diary with a special interest in the Jewish issue, and particularly the "final solution." There's no question that whatever tragedy befell the Jews in Germany during the Third Reich, Dr. Goebbels himself was the prime moving force behind it. He wasn't just the person who created the atmosphere of hatred, he was also the one who pulled the levers and started the trains in motion. What happened at the other end is still a matter of debate, and this issue is one of the moving causes of revisionism at this moment.

Goebbels didn't start out anti-Semitic. His very early diary pages, back in 1923, contain no references to the Jews, or any anti-Semitism at all, in fact. We do know that in his home town of Rheydt, a close neighbor with whom his parents maintained very close relations was Dr. Josef Joseph, a Jewish lawyer. There was a long-standing friendship between him and Goebbels' parents, who often sent their son 'round to spend the day with Dr. Joseph. (Goebbels' father, Fritz Goebbels, was bookkeeper at a local textile factory.) I'm inclined to believe that the fact that Dr. Joseph was such a close friend of Mr. and Mrs. Goebbels, and not just the boy's Catholic upbringing and the fact that his godfather was also called Joseph, may have been the reason for Goebbels' second name: Paul Joseph Goebbels.

Goebbels met Anka Stalherm at Heidelberg University, where she was one of the few women students. She was fabulously rich, had shoulder-length blonde hair, and was a typically care-free, affluent female student. Goebbels could hardly believe his luck when, of all the young men at the university, she picked him. There was undoubtedly a very close friendship between them, and all their letters have survived. (I was able to read them in the German archives until the German government, in an act of incredible spitefulness, on July 1, 1993, ordered me banned from the archives, "to protect the interests of the German people".)

In one letter to him, Anka made a mildly anti-Semitic remark, typical of those that were common in the social circles in which she moved. Indignantly he wrote back to his new girlfriend, putting her in her place. In this letter, dated February 17, 1919, Goebbels responded: "As you know, I can't stand this exaggerated anti-Semitism. My view is you don't get rid of them by huffing and puffing, let alone by pogroms, and even if you could do so, that

Jewish 'Declaration of War' Against Germany

Daily Express

JUDEA DECLARES WAR ON GERMANY

JEWS OF ALL THE WORLD UNITE

BOYCOTT OF GERMAN GOODS

MASS DEMONSTRATIONS

Mr. Churchill's Withering Attack On Premier

Officer Describes The Girl

'BROUGHT US NEARER TO WAR'

Mrs. George Lansbury Dead

THE SOVIET AMBASSADOR ENTERTAINS

Canon Shot At Prayer

Plans For Action Maturing In Europe And America

HITLER CABINET MINISTER ARRESTED LAST NIGHT

The Queen Who Lost Her Throne

You can easily wreck your car this way

or you can just neglect the LUBRICATION

Castrol LUBREQUIPMENT SERVICE

"Judea Declares War On Germany. Jews of All The World Unite. Boycott of German Goods," proclaim headlines in the London *Daily Express*, March 24, 1933. "The whole of Israel throughout the world is uniting to declare an economic and financial war on Germany," the mass-circulation British newspaper goes on in its front-page report to tell readers about the international boycott campaign. This Jewish "war on Germany" was launched even before Hitler's new National Socialist government had enacted its first anti-Jewish law.

"... All Israel is rising in wrath against the Nazi onslaught on the Jews," continues the *Daily Express* report. "... Resolutions are being taken throughout the Jewish business world to sever trade relations with Germany ... Germany is a heavy borrower in foreign money markets, where Jewish influence is considerable ... A concerted boycott by Jewish buyers is likely to involve great damage to the German export trade ..."

would be both highly ignoble and unworthy."

Furthermore, Goebbels' favorite professor at Heidelberg was Friedrich Gundolf, who was Jewish. This didn't matter to Goebbels at all. When Gundolf said that he wouldn't have time to work with Goebbels on his doctoral dissertation, he passed him on to another professor of literature, Max von Waldberg, who was also Jewish. To the end of his life, Goebbels spoke very highly of these two professors. It was typical of Goebbels that he was able to put Jews into two categories, regarding individual Jews with respect and admiration, while at the same time holding the Jewish people in contempt.

Just a few years later, though, on October 30, 1922, he delivered a lecture in Rheydt in which he commented approvingly on Oswald Spengler's criticism of the Jewish people. So you can see that a certain trend had begun to set in. I often wonder: Was this due to something innate or was it his surroundings? We are not able to pin down just what caused Goebbels to become anti-Semitic around 1922. Certainly by the time he arrived in Berlin, in 1926, as *Gauleiter* (district party leader), his anti-Semitism was in full flood, and, as we shall see, what he saw there completed the picture for him.

His formative experiences came in the aftermath of World War One, I think. Because of his club foot, the army had refused to accept him as a soldier, which was humiliating. In 1923 he worked in a bank in Cologne, where he was shocked by Jewish banking methods. He saw Jews ruining ordinary Germans, he saw speculation, and he saw inflation wiping out people's savings. His colleagues at the bank undoubtedly drew his attention to the Jewish role in all of it, as the private banks in Germany were almost entirely in Jewish hands.

Another factor played a role. When he left the university Goebbels was an aspiring writer of poetry, plays and newspaper articles. He wanted to write for the great national newspapers and magazines, which were largely controlled by the Ullstein and Mosse families, both of which were Jewish. His approaches to these two publishing companies, with articles submitted for publication, and subsequently seeking employment, were rudely rebuffed. The *Berliner Tageblatt* alone returned to him nearly 50 articles he had submitted.

No surprise, if you look at the private papers of Theodor Wolff, chief editor of the *Berliner Tageblatt*, which was published by the Mosse company. In these papers, which are filed in the German Federal archives, you can see that Wolff was corresponding almost entirely only with Jews.

It's what today we would call networking; if you're outside the loop, you can't break in. One knows this when one is mature, but when you are a young student fresh out of university, full of great



An anti-Jewish rally in Germany, 1935. The banners proclaim: "Race Lies not in the Language, but in the Blood" and "No World Peace Without Breaking the World Domination of the Jews." (Photo: National Archives, Washington, DC. From David Irving's forthcoming biography, *Dr. Goebbels: His Life and Death.*)

idealism and belief in your own superior talents, the first realization that you can't break into the loop — that the network is there to keep people like you out — makes a great impression, as it probably did on the young Dr. Goebbels. And this undoubtedly had an effect on his anti-Semitism, even though he still wasn't hostile toward individual Jews.

After Anka Stalherm left and married another young man, Goebbels started a long affair with a young woman named Else Janke. One day, while he's commenting to her on his physical debilities, telling her he realizes he must be quite unattractive because of his club foot and all the rest of it, she says, "You think you've got problems? I'm half Jewish." This was a great shock to Goebbels at that time. Her half-Jewishness, which he described as her mixed blood, grew more and more important in the relationship until it finally led to their break-up. He was actually happy when he was named Gauleiter of Berlin, where the Nazi Party was in disarray, because this gave him a chance to leave Else Janke gracefully. In Berlin he had his eyes on another girl by the name of Josephine von Behr.

At this time he also makes friends with Julius Streicher, Gauleiter of Nuremberg and publisher of the notorious anti-Semitic weekly, *Der Stürmer*. His views on Streicher vary widely throughout his diary. Sometimes he's full of praise for him, rather the way we grudgingly admire a person who is a bit bullheaded and plows ahead regardless of the damage he does. He liked Streicher as a human being, he liked him for his courage. But then again, he strongly deprecated his brand of anti-Semitism, regarding it as needlessly vulgar. This comes out again and again in the diary. It's a dichotomy that is never satisfactorily resolved until we come to one of the last items in the archives: a February 1945 letter from Goebbels to Streicher, congratulating him on his birthday and sending him a valuable oil painting. Goebbels stayed in touch with Streicher even after he fell out of favor with Hitler.

'Isidor' Weiss

When Goebbels arrived in Berlin as Gauleiter in 1926, he was confronted by a city with 179,000 Jews, one third of all Jews in Germany, and he made use of this fact. The Berlin population already was seething because of the presence of these Jews. In the coming years, Goebbels repeatedly explained to foreign diplomats that the problem there was the usual one, in which the Jewish population disproportionately controlled all the lucrative professions. This rankled with Berlin's non-Jewish population, of course, and Goebbels, whether deliberately or by instinct, zeroed in on this as a wound that he could work on to promote the Nazi cause.

He was aided in this endeavor by the fact that his chief opponent there, Berlin's Deputy Police Chief (who acted as though he was Police Chief; even the real Police Chief referred to him as being the Chief) was Dr. Bernhard Weiss, a Jew. Weiss looked so much like a Jewish caricature that his photographs didn't need to be re-touched by the Nazis. He was stereotypically Semitic in feature: short, with rounded ears and hook nose, and wearing spectacles.

In London I located Weiss' daughter, Hilda Baban-Weiss, and I pleaded with her for a more attractive photograph of her father, pointing out that the ones I have are not very flattering. I got total silence from the daughter, so I abandoned my quest. Unfortunately, when my biography of Dr.

Goebbels comes out we're going to have to use these rather unattractive pictures.

Dr. Goebbels promptly dubbed Weiss "Isidor," to such a degree of success that within two or three years there was hardly a Berliner who didn't believe that "Isidor" was his real first name.

Lida Baarova, Czech film actress who starred in German UFA films. Goebbels' love affair with her caused a scandal in 1938. (Photo: UFA studio promotional still. Courtesy of David Irving, from his forthcoming biography, *Dr. Goebbels: His Life and Death.*)

The fight between Dr. Bernhard Weiss and Dr. Joseph Goebbels, is, I think, one of the most hilarious, improbable stories to come out of this era. Twenty-eight times Weiss sued Goebbels for calling him a Jew. Twenty-eight times the judges pointed out to Weiss that he was in fact Jewish, and therefore it was no libel. On one occasion, Dr. Goebbels' newspaper *Der Angriff* published a cartoon showing a donkey with the head of Dr. Weiss, with all of its legs splayed on an ice pond, and a caption reading: "Isidor on thin ice." Isidor Weiss (you see, even I'm calling him Isidor now), immediately sued for libel. Goebbels pointed out it was just a cartoon, but the judge said it was quite obvious that the donkey had the face of Dr. Weiss. Whereupon a headline in the next issue of *Der Angriff* declared: "Judge Confirms Donkey Has Face of Dr. Weiss."

A German scholar recently published a 600-page book purely devoted to the fight between Dr. Goebbels and Dr. Weiss. It would be worth having this book in English, except that the problems between the two men are almost untranslatable.

As Goebbels orchestrated the rise of the Nazi party in Berlin, part of the problem for the democrats there was that much of what he said was true. The Jewish community not only dominated the legal and medical professions in Berlin, they also dominated the crime scene. In my biography I've quoted Interpol figures of the percentage of Jews among those arrested for drug dealing and narcotics. Moreover, three-quarters of the pickpockets in Berlin were Jewish. It was quite easy for Goebbels to draw attention to such facts, and to embellish them in a propaganda campaign. This came to him as second nature. In every new scandal in Berlin, it seemed, Jews were at the base of it — ripping off the banks, ripping off the taxpayers, and ripping off the government. And again and again, they seemed to be getting off scot-free.

At Syracuse University I found the private papers of Heinrich Brüning, who was Hitler's predecessor as Chancellor (1930–1932). In this collection is a manuscript in which he describes his problems as Chancellor. Brüning recounts that at one time, he ordered an investigation of Jewish banks in Berlin and their methods, and in his manuscript he writes: "The results were so horrifying that I ordered this document to be kept secret, because if it had been allowed to become public knowledge, it would have resulted in anti-Jewish riots." Of course, even though much of what Goebbels said was true, this just doesn't justify what he did later on. We must, in all fairness, keep emphasizing this point.

During the 1920s Goebbels wrote a play called *Michael*, and it's interesting to compare the various drafts of it, which are available. When he first wrote it back in 1923 or 1924, it was a straightforward kind of morality play. But Goebbels would change things. After Anka Stalherm annoyed him, he changed the leading female character. And as he became more and more annoyed with the Jews, he wrote more anti-Semitism into the play. In the drafts you can see him becoming progressively more anti-Jewish.

After seeing his first Hollywood movie, he wrote in his diary (on Dec. 3, 1928): "Sheer hell. Jewish kitsch. Virtually all you saw were Hebrews." A few months later, on February 15, 1929, he wrote: "The Jewish question is the questions of all questions."

There is a curious passage in his private diary that shows how increasingly obsessed he had become. It was after three years in Berlin as Gaule-

Ernst vom Rath, 29-year-old legation secretary at the German embassy in Paris, was murdered in November 1938 by Herschel Grynszpan.

iter, fighting this increasingly desperate battle, almost with one hand tied behind his back, being repeatedly banned on orders of Dr. Weiss, having repeatedly nearly been sent to prison himself. One night he has a dream, which he then records in his diary (December 17, 1929). In this dream he's back at school, running madly through the corridors with pillars flashing past him, and he's being chased by Jews screaming at him, "Hate, hate, hate." He's always able to keep a few limping strides ahead of his pursuers, occasionally turning round and flinging back at them the same taunt: "Hate, hate, hate!" What an odd thing for a man to write in his own diary. One doesn't often write down one's own dreams in a diary. The mere fact that he had dreams like that shows that he was becoming obsessed with these Jews, the enemy.

More and more episodes occurred to give him reasons to dislike Jews. After Horst Wessel, a young Nazi stormtrooper who composed the hymn that subsequently became the second national anthem of Nazi Germany, was murdered in early 1930 by a communist in Berlin, it was a Jew who gave refuge to the murderers when they fled. This kind of thing will have undoubtedly had an effect of Goebbels. He would have chalked it up on his list of grudges.

Even worse, after he began going out with Magda Quandt (whose stepfather, Friedländer, he knew had been Jewish), it happened that for days at a time she didn't come to see him. After a while, she doesn't answer the phone or keep dates, and eventually Goebbels finds out he has a rival: a Jew named Victor Arlosoroff, who is also enraged to find out that she's two-timing him with the Nazi Gauleiter of Berlin. Arlosoroff is so enraged, in fact, that during one meeting he pulls out a revolver, and in a jealous, dramatic scene, fires at her, deliberately missing. The bullet buries itself in the wall near her. She gets him out of her life, although he keeps returning and pleading to be taken back.

This man is none other than Victor Chaim Arlosoroff, who subsequently became an important Zionist figure. After Hitler came to power, he was the Zionist representative in the negotiations with the new Nazi government that resulted in the *Ha'avara* ("Transfer") agreement, whereby German Jews could emigrate to Palestine with their property. In June 1933 Arlosoroff was murdered in Tel Aviv, Palestine, by members of the Jabotinsky faction of the Zionist movement. The fact that the love of his life was two-timing him with an ardent Zionist may also have contributed to Goebbels' growing dislike of Jews.

Goebbels was besotted with Magda, there's no question, and once again he couldn't believe his own luck. They were married in December 1931. In fact, though, she was rather ambivalent about him, and it appears that the only reason she started dating him was, as they say, to be near the fascinating Mr. Hitler. There was even a rumor that her son, Helmut, was fathered by Hitler. When you look at photographs of little Helmut, though, you can be pretty certain that this is not true, because he looks just like Dr. Goebbels.

Boycotts

A month after the Nazis came to power in January 1933, Goebbels was really able to flex his muscles. He wasn't appointed Propaganda Minister immediately because Hitler needed Goebbels to direct his party's propaganda campaign in one final election battle, and, as Hitler pointed out to him, it wouldn't be right for the Reich Propaganda Minister, a government official, simultaneously to direct the Nazi party's propaganda election campaign.

We must not overlook the fact that the world's Jewish community lost no time in striking at Nazi Germany. We all too readily talk about the book-burning and about the Nazi boycott against the Jews as if those things happened in vacuum. They

didn't. The Nazi boycott against the Jews on April 1, 1933, was a foolish reprisal by the Nazis in retaliation for the Jewish boycott against Germany.

As soon as the Nazis came to power the world Jewish community announced an international boycott campaign against Germany. Jews would not buy any German products. They would not accept any more German films, for example, and would see that others would not accept them. Jewish restaurateurs in England announced they would no longer serve German customers. If you read the newspapers of the day, such as the London *Daily Express*, you'll find all the details of this anti-German Jewish boycott, which is now all too readily forgotten. Today all we hear about is the Nazi boycott against the Jews, which lasted for a single day — Saturday, April 1, 1933. Brown shirt SA men stood outside Jewish businesses and shops, and admonished customers against entering.

As a warning to Jews abroad to go easy on Nazi Germany, the boycott failed, of course. It just enraged the international Jewish community even more. At the time, and ever since, the Nazis were effectively rapped on the knuckles for that boycott. It was Goebbels who organized that boycott, even though, if you read his diary, you can get the impression that Hitler authorized it, sanctioned it, and possibly even suggested it. But there's no doubt at all in my mind that this is another case of Goebbels having an idea, of putting it into effect, and then playing a trick by writing in his diary that he'd gotten Hitler's approval in advance. He had already done something like this in 1932, when he railroaded Hitler into an unsuccessful election campaign for Reich President against Paul von Hindenburg. In his diary he rather implies that Hitler asked him to go ahead with it and sanctioned it in advance. We see exactly the same phenomenon in November 1938: the "Night of Broken Glass."

Yet even in 1932–1933, he was still somewhat ambivalent in his feelings about the Jews. He could still split his sides with laughter, as he writes in his diary on May 16, 1933, at a nightclub listening to Jewish comedian Otto Wallburg. This same Otto Wallburg later died in Auschwitz. So there you have the whole of the tragedy of Jews and the Third Reich encapsulated in one man's fate. (You notice I used the word "died." I didn't say he was gassed or was killed or murdered at Auschwitz. He died. We don't know how he died — it's tragic enough that he did.)

The Nazi campaign against the Jews included Goebbels' systematic campaign to remove them from the theater, art and music. He argued that the Jews tried to dominate, and that this was not for the general good of the community. There was an outcry from the artists themselves, of course. For example, the internationally renowned conductor of the Berlin Philharmonic, Wilhelm Furtwängler, bravely defended fellow conductor Otto Klemperer and other Jewish artists. In a letter to Furtwängler (which was published in *The New York Times*, April 16, 1933), Goebbels wrote: "Those of Jewish blood who have real ability should be free to exercise their art, but they must not rule."

Jews began a campaign of assassination against Nazis in February 1936, when David Frankfurter shot Wilhelm Gustloff, leader of the Nazi party in Switzerland. Then, in November 1938, another Jew, Herschel Grynszpan, assassinated Ernst vom Rath, a young diplomat at the German embassy in Paris. These incidents further contributed to Goebbels' perception of the international Jewish community, namely, that Jews would stop at nothing to get back at the Nazis. All his previous Jewish enemies, such as Dr. Weiss, expecting short shrift from the Nazis, had emigrated from Germany. Some went to Prague, some to Paris, some to London, and others to the United States — from where they campaigned against Nazi Germany.

Hitler's 'Final Solution'

On April 11, 1938, the diary records a very interesting conversation in which Hitler reveals to him for the first time that his "Final Solution" of the Jewish problem is to deport the world's Jews, particularly those in Germany and in Europe, to some faraway country, possibly Madagascar. Hitler swore by the Madagascar solution. Even in July 1942, two months after the island country had been occupied by the British, Hitler is still saying that Madagascar is the ideal solution.

In June 1938, two months later, Goebbels begins an anti-Jewish campaign of his own. Six months before "Crystal Night," Goebbels and Berlin's police chief, Count von Helldorff, decided between them to start a campaign of systematic harassment of the city's Jews. Even after the Nazis came to power, the number of Jews continued to increase in Berlin, which didn't please Goebbels at all. Berlin was his city, and yet the Jews still had considerable presence and economic clout. The only way to reverse the trend, he told the police chief, is to start hounding and harassing them.

In the University of Princeton library there's a file called the Adolf Hitler papers, which consists of documents relieved in 1945 by an American soldier from Hitler's apartment in Munich. It contains a June 1938 letter from Goebbels to Hitler, reporting on this campaign of harassment. All the Jews in Berlin had their motor cars called in for inspection: most of them were found to be unroadworthy, and they were ordered off the roads. They also had their telephones cut off. Berlin's Jews were subjected to



In these pages from his diary, Goebbels writes about the outbreak of the German-Polish conflict in 1939. During the final weeks of the war, Goebbels had his diary photographically recorded in reduced size on glass plates, a new Agfa process that was an early form of microfiche. At the end of the war, Soviet Russian troops seized these plates, which remained suppressed in Moscow for 45 years. (From Irving's forthcoming biography, *Dr. Goebbels: His Life and Death.*)

all sorts of petty police harassment such as this. It's very similar to what is happening now in Germany to revisionists — harassing people within the law, rather the way your [United States] government suddenly inflicts a tax audit on someone who is politically incorrect.

'Crystal Night'

The key event in this whole story was, of course, the "Crystal Night" ("*Kristallnacht*"), or "Night of Broken Glass" in 1938. Here the Goebbels diary must be treated with the utmost caution. It began on November 7, 1938, with the assassination of a German diplomat in Paris by a Polish Jew, Herschel Grynszpan. News of the shooting triggered a number of small scale anti-Jewish outbreaks all over Germany, which Goebbels noted in his diary without at first paying any special attention to them. However, when news reached him of the young diplomat's death, two days later, it truly outraged him. It came while he was with Hitler at a meeting in Munich, commemorating the annual Nazi party anniversary of the failed "Beer Hall Putsch" of November 9, 1923.

After Hitler had left the meeting, Goebbels came to the podium to announce the death of the German diplomat. He also reported to the assembled Gauleiters on the anti-Jewish incidents that had already broken out, describing them as manifestations of a "spontaneous" public outrage. Goebbels said, in effect: "A Jew has fired a shot. A German has died. Obviously our people will be outraged about this. This is not the time to rein in that outrage." We have two or three independent sources for what he said that evening, including the report by the British consul in Munich, who very quickly learned of the speech and reported it to London. This report is now in the British archives.

Describing the evening's events, Goebbels writes in his diary that, after his brief speech: "Everyone makes a beeline for the telephones." He adds: "Now the public will take action." An interesting turn of

phrase, he creates an image of men in brown uniforms and swastika arm bands reaching out to telephones to relay orders all over Germany.

The orders were that the *Aktion* (operation) was to be carried out by SA men in plain clothes, and the police were not to intervene. There was to be no bloodshed and no harm done to anyone unless, of course, Jews offered armed resistance, in which case they should expect short shrift. "There is to be no looting," stormtroopers in Kiel were told. "Nobody is to be roughed up. Foreign Jews are not to be touched. Meet any resistance with firearms. The *Aktion* is to be carried out in plain clothes and must be finished by five a.m."

The result was the Night of Broken Glass, one of Germany's darkest nights. Hundreds if not thousands of Jewish shops were destroyed. About 150 synagogues were burned to the ground, including six or seven in Berlin. The following morning the news was that 38 Jews had been murdered. On Hitler's orders, 20,000 Jews were rounded up and temporarily held in concentration camps.

After the overnight reports had come in, Goebbels sums up the object of the exercise in a heartless, unrepentant diary entry: "As was to be expected, the entire nation is in uproar. This is one dead man who is costing the Jews dear. Our darling Jews will think twice in future before simply gunning down German diplomats."

In the archives I found a document dated the next day, November 10, which shows quite clearly that some kind of order had actually been issued. That morning Goebbels sent the following message to all 42 Nazi party propaganda officials (*Gaupropagandaleiter*) at the provincial level: "The anti-Jewish *Aktionen* [operations] must now be called off with the same rapidity with which they were launched. They have served their desired and anticipated purpose." These are the key lines in this document, I think, because they do imply that an order had been issued the day before. We don't have that earlier document, but references to it were made during the postwar interrogation of one or two of the Gauleiters, and there's also a hint in his diary that he had given certain orders the previous day.

Goebbels had to issue this second order calling off the *Aktionen* because, as we now know (a member of Hitler's private staff confirmed it to me), Hitler was furious when he heard, during the night, about the anti-Jewish outbreaks. Throughout the night, telephone calls came in reporting synagogues blazing across Germany. Hitler sent for Himmler and asked: "What the hell is going on here, *Reichsführer*?" Himmler replied: "Send for Goebbels, he knows." Hitler summoned Goebbels and raked him over the coals. The following morning Goebbels wrote in his diary: "I went to see the Führer at 11 o'clock, and we discussed what to do next." You can just imagine what kind of conversation took place between Hitler and Goebbels. Of course, Goebbels isn't going to write in his diary "the Führer called me a bloody idiot for having started what I did last night" — that's not the kind of diary he kept. Instead, he wrote a one-line entry to remind himself that he did have to go to see the Führer. What he did next was to issue the November 10 order calling for an immediate stop to all the anti-Jewish *Aktionen*.

Here, I'm afraid, I have to disagree with our colleague Ingrid Weckert; but if a revisionist can't revise another revisionist, I don't know what a revisionist is. Weckert rather exonerates Dr. Goebbels from any blame for the "Crystal Night." [See Weckert's book, *Flashpoint*, published by the IHR, and her article, "'Crystal Night' 1938," in the Summer 1985 *Journal*.]

However, there is no doubt in my mind that on that night, having gotten the news that the German diplomat died, Goebbels — incautiously, imprudently, and out of a sheer sense of mischief — ordered the Gauleiters to go out and start raising hell against the Jews. And, of course, it got out of hand.

Even then, Goebbels didn't realize the extent to which the world's press would seize on this incident. Few of the top Nazis had ever travelled outside of Germany. They didn't realize what the foreign press was like. They didn't realize that outside Germany, then as now, there are societies that look on German actions with a certain degree of wonderment and bafflement. The foreign press seized on this extraordinary incident, which in the over-heated political climate of 1938 Germany might have seemed little more than an extension of a street fight. But in peaceful democracies this kind of thing just didn't go on. From Berlin, reporters sent back horrific accounts to England, to the United States and to the other free countries.

Ribbentrop, the German Foreign Minister, was one of those most scandalized by what Goebbels had done. Himmler was furious. Göring went to Hitler and demanded that Goebbels be dismissed for this outrage. Goebbels had an appalling time trying to repair the damage that he had done. It is baffling why Hitler tolerated what Goebbels had done. Hitler told Ribbentrop, "I need this man because I have other things in mind, and I am going to need a propaganda minister of the caliber of Dr. Goebbels." This can be the only explanation why he turned a blind eye to Goebbels' blooper, and it doesn't speak very highly of Hitler.

Years later, in July 1944, when he was pleading to be put in charge of Germany's "total war" mobilization effort, Goebbels wrote this *mea culpa* to Hitler: "I know that I've caused you many a private

worry in the 20 years I've been with you, particularly in 1938 and 1939." Although Hitler does appoint him commissioner of total war, this is a very important admission. Obviously between Hitler and Goebbels at that time there was colossal personal strain. It wasn't just because of his affair in 1936–1938 with Lida Baarova, the Czech actress. (She is now 80 years old, still a lady of great beauty, and living in Salzburg. I went to interview her a few months ago.) Rather, it was undoubtedly the grief that Goebbels had caused Hitler by *Kristallnacht*.

Changes After the Outbreak of War

When war broke out in 1939, Jewish leader Chaim Weizmann, president of both the World Zionist Organization and the "Jewish Agency," made the tactical mistake of declaring war on Germany in the name of the entire Jewish people around the world. This was a crucial error because — as Professor Ernst Nolte and some other historians have argued — it somewhat justified what the Nazis then did to the Jews: the Jews declared war on Germany and Germany declared war on the Jews. [The text of Weizmann's declaration, along with an interview with Prof. Nolte, and a review of his recent book, are in the Jan.–Feb. 1994 *Journal*, pp. 15–22, 37–41.]

During a visit to Poland in June 1934, Goebbels had visited the Jewish ghetto in Warsaw. He recorded his impression in his diary: "Stinking and filthy. The *Ostjuden*. There they are." Five years later, after the defeat of Poland in 1939, he visited another Jewish ghetto in that country, this time the one in Lodz. He was just as shocked by what he saw, writing in his diary: "Our task isn't a humanitarian one, but a surgical one. Otherwise one day Europe will succumb to the Jewish pestilence."

After once again setting eyes on these Jewish "specimens," the idea came to him to begin making anti-Jewish films. The result was the three infamous anti-Jewish films made by the Nazis. Interesting, isn't it? Of the approximately one thousand motion pictures made by the Nazis during their entire twelve years in power, just three were anti-Jewish: "The Rothschilds," "The Eternal Jew" and "*Jud Süss*" ("The Jew Suess"). These three films — the last two going down in propaganda history — were very much part of Goebbels' broad-front attack on the Jews. And yet, how many anti-German films has Hollywood made in revenge? It doesn't bear counting.

"*Jud Süss*," which starred some of the Third Reich's best movie actors, told the story of Joseph Süss-Oppenheimer, an 18th century "Court Jew" financier who was able to rob the Duchy of Württemberg on a Robert Maxwellian scale, and who ends up being publicly hanged — to the general plaudits of the citizens.

To my mind, "The Eternal Jew" is the most insidious of the three because, as a documentary, it purported to show Jews as they were. On Goebbels' orders Jews were filmed in the ghettos of Poland, at their most profane and their most contemptible. He wanted yards and yards of footage showing Jews as caricatures. With this he mingled footage of rats invading bags of wheat and grain. Concluding the film, in one of its two versions, was an appalling, stomach-churning scene, filmed in close-up, of Jewish ritual slaughter of cattle. This was appended to the end of the film in what I think was a rather crude and vulgar tactic. So two versions of "The Eternal Jew" were made — one, with the ritual slaughter scene, for adults, and a second, cleaned up version, for children and others with weaker stomachs. But even the knowledge that there was a stronger version had a propaganda effect on people.

Germany Must Perish

In March 1941, Goebbels visited the "Warthegau," a portion of Poland that was incorporated into the German Reich. After a meeting there with the local Gauleiter, Arthur Greiser, Goebbels recorded in his diary: "There has been all manner of liquidating going on here, particularly of the Jewish garbage. That's got to be."

A crucial episode in the "Final Solution," as far as Goebbels is concerned — and this has been very little highlighted — came in 1941 with the publication in the United States of a strange little book, *Germany Must Perish*, by an American named Theodore N. Kaufman. In it, Kaufman — who was, presumably, a Jew — recommends the castration of the entire German people, so that the Germans would literally perish within one generation. "Germany must perish forever!," wrote Kaufman. "In fact — not in fancy." Published at a time when the United States was still officially not at war against Germany, this book was given respectful, even laudatory attention by *Time* magazine, *The Washington Post*, and other periodicals.

Goebbels seized with delight on this nasty propaganda diatribe against the German people, with all its Freudian undertones. "This Jew [Kaufman] has done a disservice to the enemy," Goebbels commented. "If he had composed the book at my behest he couldn't have done a better job."

Goebbels looked into the feasibility of having a million copies of a German translation printed up and distributed to German soldiers. He shelved the project because his lawyers pointed out that the project would violate US copyrights. You may laugh but, as he wrote in his diary, the reasoning was that if Germany violated American copyrights, America might feel justified in violating Germany's very valuable copyrights. He had to wait another few

months until certain historical events in Hawaii resulted in American copyrights not being so valuable after all.

Kaufman's book figures in Goebbels' diary as being the turning point that justified, in his mind, adopting a much more radical solution to the Jewish problem.

In August 1941, he went to show Hitler *Germany Must Perish* in translation, and persuaded him to agree to a plan by which every German Jew would be fitted out with a yellow Star of David badge with the word *Jude*. Goebbels argued that the Jews had to be tagged, and Hitler agreed. It's interesting to note — and this can't be emphasized enough — that again and again it's Goebbels who goes to Hitler with radical plans, and Hitler agrees. It's never Hitler initiating these plans. This is true even when the diary appears to indicate otherwise, as in the case of *Kristallnacht* and other episodes when, for reasons of politics and posterity, Goebbels felt it necessary to write: "The Führer fully endorsed what I had done."


Germany
Must Perish

BY THEODORE N. KAUFMAN

☆

ARGYLE PRESS, NEWARK, NEW JERSEY

Title page of *Germany Must Perish*, by Theodore N. Kaufman, a Manhattan-born Jewish businessman who was chairman of the "American Federation of Peace." In this 1941 book, Kaufman outlines a plan for the systematic sterilization of the entire German population. This genocidal work was given respectful reviews in the American press. Typical was the one in *Time* magazine, March 24, 1941, which called Kaufman's plan a "sensational idea."

I have to point out that we are reading the diary of a Propaganda Minister, a master dissembler whose diary has frequently been found to be untrustworthy on earlier occasions. And when dealing with what he writes about a man such as Hitler, who is dead and can't defend himself, you have to be extra careful. It may stick in the craw of other historians when I say this, but it doesn't matter if the man is Hitler or Roosevelt or Stalin: If he's not here to defend himself you have to be ten times more careful when trying to write the truth. *That's why* I've been additionally careful in evaluating the diary of Dr. Goebbels.

During a visit to the Eastern front in November 1941, Goebbels toured the German-occupied Baltic states — Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia. On this occasion as well, he viewed the ghettos. In Lithuania he spent a whole afternoon touring the Jewish ghetto in Kaunas (Kovno), and wrote disapproving passages in his diary about what he found there. As he records, Goebbels was also told that the Jews in the Baltic states had been massacred on a colossal scale, not by the Germans but by the Lithuanians and Latvians themselves, even as the German troops arrived, in revenge for what the Jews had done to them during the year of Bolshevik terror following the Soviet Russian takeover in June 1940.

When German troops arrived in the Baltic states, they found that the local Jews had largely fled or been evacuated. The Germans then decided to evacuate the German Jews to these Baltic territories. I don't know why they hit on this mad solution, because if the Baltic peoples themselves didn't like their own Jews, these territories certainly weren't going to be very safe for foreign Jews. But the Germans didn't really care.

Goebbels and Speer

It may surprise you to learn that the prime mover behind the evacuation of Berlin's Jews was less Dr. Goebbels than that great hero of the postwar media, Albert Speer. If you read Speer's genuine diary, not the sanitized one he gave to the German Federal Archives, but his genuine diary, you'll find that from early 1941, when he was chief of construction for Berlin, he makes repeated references to the "Main Resettlement Department" ("*Hauptabteilung Umsiedlung*"), which he controlled.

You see, Speer — who was a close friend of Goebbels and his wife — had been given the task of rebuilding Berlin — a fine and appropriate task for an ambitious young architect with great vision, and, it has to be said, also great ability. In order to rebuild Berlin, though, he had first to clear slums, and this required that he house the slum-dwellers elsewhere. So, wanting to clear the Jewish areas of

west Berlin, he persuaded Goebbels to start a campaign to drive the Jews out of the city, and thus empty their apartments. Speer had his eye on something like 24,000 Jewish houses and apartments in Berlin.

In early 1941, Speer and Goebbels, each for reasons of his own, together started this campaign to drive the Jews from the city. Goebbels, who was Gauleiter of Berlin, wanted to have his city "free of Jews," and Speer wanted to clear out those 24,000 apartments so that he could rebuild Berlin.

So, trainload by trainload, Jews were shipped out of Berlin to anywhere — nobody really cared. The chiefs of police, Kurt Daluege and Helldorff joined in because they were pals of Goebbels. Only occasionally did Goebbels have to get approval from Hitler, in broad general terms, for yet another operation against the Jews. We know how many Jews were in those trains — there were about 130 trainloads altogether — because in almost every case we know exactly how many Jews were loaded onto each train.

Theodore N. Kaufman

We know the exact route and destination of those trains because, by some quirk of historical fate, the actual rail records have survived. They show that there were around a thousand Jews per trainload — sometimes as few as about 650 passengers, sometimes as many as 1030. The first of these trainloads left Berlin on October 18, 1941 — to the plaudits of Speer and Goebbels. These rail deportations were irregular because this was a low priority program. At a time when German troops were fighting a desperate battle outside Moscow, rail rolling stock and rail networks were needed, above all, for munitions, supplies, troop reinforcements, wounded soldiers, hospital trains, and all the rest. But whenever they could, Goebbels and Speer would deport another trainload of Jews.

Single Jews with no families were the first to be rounded up and deported. If the family had a "privileged" member — for example, a Jew who had married a non-Jew, or a Jewish man who was working in a munitions factory — that one member saved the entire family. Jews who weren't privileged in some way were liable to be picked up without warning, allowed only 40 kilograms of baggage, put on a train and shipped out.

In one particular case, we know that a trainload of 1030 Jews left Berlin on November 27, 1941, destined for Riga, Latvia. It's recorded in the Speer diary and in the Goebbels diary. It arrived at a place called Skiatowa, eight kilometers outside Riga, on the morning of November 30, 1941, in the midst of a mass extermination. So these newly-arrived Jews were taken along with local Riga Jews, lined up along pits, and shot.

That very day, Heinrich Himmler went to see Hitler at his headquarters. In my book *Hitler's War* [in the 1991 Focal Point edition, between pages 506–507], you'll find a facsimile of Himmler's own handwritten notes of his telephone conversations on that day, when he made a couple of phone calls from Hitler's headquarters. One note records a call at 1:30 p.m., Nov. 30, 1941, to Gestapo chief Reinhard Heydrich. It reads: "Jew transport from Berlin. No liquidation."

Until I found these bundles of telephone notes, not one historian in the world had bothered to read them or quote them. They were written in old-fashioned handwriting, you see, and the German historians rather like to have the documents they consult printed, especially in the Nuremberg bound volumes, and even better, with illustrations. They don't like reading old German handwriting.

What's the explanation for Himmler's words here? My theory is that he may have said to Hitler: "Mein Führer, I've got a bit of a problem housing these Jews we're shipping out of Berlin. Why don't we just bump them off?," and Hitler probably answered: "Out of the question." So Himmler sends a frantic message to Heydrich, saying they're not to be liquidated. But it's too late, they're already dead — the whole trainload. We know this because we have the timetable of what happened that day.

On March 5, 1942, Goebbels received a report from Heydrich about guerilla warfare in the occupied east. Blaming the Jews for this as well, he comments:

> It is therefore understandable that many of them must pay with their lives for this. Anyway, in my view the more Jews who are liquidated the more consolidated the situation in Europe will be after the war. Let there be no phony sentimentalism about it. The Jews are Europe's misfortune. They must somehow be eliminated otherwise we are in danger of being eliminated by them.

Here I want to mention something that I'm always very adamant about. Although we revisionists say that gas chambers didn't exist, and that the "factories of death" didn't exist, there is no doubt in my mind that on the Eastern front large numbers of Jews were massacred, by criminals with guns — SS men, Ukrainians, Lithuanians, whatever — to get

TERRA
Jud Süß
FERDINAND MARIAN * KRISTINA SÖDERBAUM * HEINRICH GEORGE
WERNER KRAUSS * EUGEN KLOPFER
ALBERT FLORATH * MALTE JAEGER * THEODOR LOOS * HILDE VON STOLZ * ELSE ELSTER
WALTER WERNER * JACOB TIEDTKE
SPIELLEITUNG: VEIT HARLAN
Drehbuch: Veit Harlan, Eberhard Wolfgang Möller, Ludwig Metzger * Musik: Wolfgang Zeller
Herstellungsgruppe: Otto Lehmann
EIN VEIT HARLAN-FILM DER TERRA
URAUFFÜHRUNG
UFA-PALAST AM ZOO / BERLIN
JETZT IN ALLEN FÜHRENDEN THEATERN IM REICH
Schon an der Flasche erkennt man
Coca-Cola
koffeinhaltig - köstlich - erfrischend

One of the three anti-Jewish films made during the Third Reich era was *"Jud Süss"* ("The Jew Süss"), which was based on the life of Joseph Süss-Oppenheimer, a powerful "Court Jew" in 18th century Germany. This advertisement announcing the premiere of the Terra film production appeared in the Berlin weekly *Das Reich*, Sept. 29, 1940. An ad for Coca-Cola ("Already recognizable in the bottle") appeared directly below.

rid of them. They were made to line up next to pits or ditches, and then shot. The eyewitness accounts I've seen of this are genuine and reliable.

Wannsee Conference

In late 1941 Heydrich sent a message to all the relevant ministers and state secretaries calling them to a high-level conference on the Jewish question. This is the famous Wannsee Conference, which took place on January 20, 1942, at a villa in suburban Berlin. There the officials discussed how to deal with all the administrative problems of large-scale transportations of Jews. There's no reference to killing Jews, not even an indication, anywhere in the Conference record.

Goebbels was not present at that meeting because the invitation that was sent to the Propaganda Ministry was addressed to Leopold Gutterer, the Ministry State Secretary and Goebbels' number two man. Gutterer is still alive, age 92. I went to interview him two or three times before I was banned from Germany (on November 9, 1993). He told me he never got the Wannsee meeting invitation, that it was probably intercepted by Werner Naumann, who was his rival on Goebbels staff.

Although Goebbels did not hear in advance of the meeting, you'll find in Goebbels' diary — in his entry of March 7, 1942 — that a copy of the well-known Wannsee Conference protocol was sent to him. Nobody else has spotted this.

There were still eleven million Jews in Europe, Goebbels dictated on that day, accurately summarizing the document. "For the time being they are to be concentrated in the east [until] later; possibly an island like Madagascar can be assigned to them after the war." It all raised a host of "delicate questions," he added. "Undoubtedly there will be a multitude of personal tragedies," he wrote airily, "But this is unavoidable. The situation now is ripe for a final settlement of the Jewish question."

More chilling is another diary entry a few weeks later. On March 27, 1942, Goebbels dictates a lengthy passage about another SS document that had been submitted to him, and which appears to have been much uglier in its content. "Beginning with Lublin," he states, "the Jews are now being deported eastward from the General Government

[occupied Poland]. The procedure is pretty barbaric and one that beggars description, and there's not much left of the Jews. Broadly speaking one can probably say that 60 percent of them will have to be liquidated, while only 40 percent can be put to work."

It's a very ugly passage, and it's easy to link this diary passage with everything we've seen in the movies and on television since then. He's describing "Schindler's List" here — or is he? I don't know. All he's actually saying here is that the Jews are having a pretty rigorous time. They're being deported, it's happening in a systematic way, and not many of them are going to survive it.

When I visited the Hoover Institution library in Stanford, California, to see the portion of the original Goebbels diary that they have there, this was the first page I asked to see. And when I was in the Moscow archives to examine the glass plate copy of the diary, this was also the first plate I searched for. I knew that if the diary had actually been copied by the Nazis in Berlin, and the glass plate version in Moscow matches the text in the Hoover library, there's no way anyone could have faked it. And there it is on the glass plate in Moscow, identical. As a final clincher, this portion was also microfilmed in 1947 in New York from the text that is held by the Hoover library. So there are three different indications that this is a genuine quotation from a genuine Goebbels document.

The conclusion I draw therefore is that, between them, Speer and Goebbels started a ruthless campaign in 1941 to drive out and deport the Jews from Berlin — Goebbels for political reasons, and out of sheer visceral hatred of the Jews, and Speer for the more mundane reasons of real estate and ambition. They didn't really care what happened to the Jews.

Even so, we must put all this in the context of the brutal war being fought on the Eastern front at the time, in which neither side was giving the other any quarter. By this time (March 1942) we British had just begun bombing German towns on a ruthless scale. The devastating aerial bombardment of Lübeck, for example, came just two days after this diary entry. It's not difficult to imagine Dr. Goebbels' attitude: "So what if Jews are being machine-gunned into pits? They had it coming to them. They declared war on us, and this is no time for sympathy and sentiment." That's the way he may well have looked at it.

By this time, ugly rumors were already circulating abroad, fuelled by British propaganda. The London *Daily Telegraph* quoted Polish claims that seven thousand of Warsaw's Jews were being killed each day, often in what it called "gas chambers." One of Goebbels' worried civil servants responded by telexing a request for information to Hans Frank's press office in Krakow and to the propaganda field office in Warsaw. The reassuring reply spoke of the Jews being used to construct defences and roads. Be that as it may, in Goebbels' files the original press report, which had merely summarized the British newspaper item, was rubber-stamped *Geheime Reichssache*, "Secret Reich Matter."

How much did Goebbels know? Among his surviving files are papers suggesting a broad general knowledge of atrocities. One is from a large collection of original Goebbels' papers on file at the Jewish Yivo institute in New York.

Reporting to Goebbels on November 11, 1942, his legal expert, Dr Hans Schmidt-Leonhardt, whom he had sent to inspect conditions in Hans Frank's Polish dominions, noted that the Warsaw police had deemed it too dangerous to visit the ghetto there; in the Krakow ghetto he had found all the Jews put to work; in Lublin the ghetto had already been cleared away, and there were now bloody disturbances. "As a *Geheime Reichssache*," reported the legal specialist, "Frank related to us the following characteristic recent instance: ..." But whatever this was we cannot know, because a shocked member of Goebbels' staff cut off the rest of the page.

This is something that you have to look for, this "top secret" endorsement. By contrast, the Auschwitz documents found in the Moscow archives by French researcher Jean-Claude Pressac have no "secret" classification whatsoever. But this document, with its missing half page, tells me that Goebbels knew damn well that something ugly was probably happening on the Eastern front, and that he didn't want members of his staff asking awkward questions, so he had part of the page torn off and locked away in his safe.

I sometimes wonder what his stenographer, Richard Otte, must have thought about the man whose words he transcribed day by day for this diary.

So there are the facts about Dr. Goebbels and the "final solution." If we're looking for a culprit, if we're looking for a criminal behind the "final solution" or the "Holocaust," whatever it was, for the man who started it in motion, then it was undoubtedly Dr. Goebbels first and foremost. Not Julius Streicher, not Adolf Hitler, nor any of the other Nazis. Goebbels was the moving force, and the brain behind it in every sense of the word. We still don't know if he knew what exactly happened at the other end, but then this isn't surprising, because we ourselves don't know either.

He that answereth a matter before he heareth of it, it is folly and shame unto him.

— Proverbs 18:13

Goebbels' Place in History

MARK WEBER

No other name is so firmly associated with the term *propaganda*, conjuring lies and deceit, than that of Dr. Joseph Goebbels. But the popular image of this man, particularly in the United States, is a crude caricature.

Following his birth in 1897 in Rheydt, a medium-size city in the German Rhineland, Paul Joseph Goebbels was raised in a solidly middle-class, staunchly Roman Catholic family.

Although physically unimpressive and handicapped (one leg was shorter than the other), he was gifted with intelligence, a quick tongue and a melodious voice. He excelled in his studies. After a rigorous *Gymnasium* "humanistic" education, he studied at several German universities, receiving a doctorate from Heidelberg University in 1921.

After an unsuccessful effort to find employment as a writer for major national daily papers, and a nine-month stint working at a bank in Cologne, he became an activist in the fledgling National Socialist Party, and served as editor of two party periodicals, the weekly *Völkische Freiheit* ("National Freedom") and, later, of *NS-Briefe* ("NS Letters").

With pronounced working class sympathies, and even some pro-Communist sentiments, during this period he was known as a member of the Party's "left wing."

In 1926, Hitler appointed him *Gauleiter* for Berlin. He lost no time taking firm control of the small and feuding Party organization there, and infusing it with new dynamism. Goebbels threw himself into his task, quickly proving himself a master organizer and public speaker. As part of his ceaseless efforts in Germany's most important city, in July 1927 he started his own newspaper, *Der Angriff* ("The Attack").

Goebbels' faced an uphill battle because he aimed, above all, to win support from the city's working class population — which overwhelmingly supported the Marxist Social Democratic and Communist parties — while at the same time not alienating middle class voters.

This strategy was perhaps most severely tested during the 1932 Berlin transport workers strike, which paralyzed the great city's bus, elevated railway and subway systems. Only the National Socialists and the Communists supported the workers in their strike against the city government, which was controlled by the Social Democratic party. The result was an odd temporary "Nazi-Commie" alliance that alarmed many middle class Germans.

Goebbels missed no opportunity for humor, sarcasm or mockery. When the Social Democratic government banned the wearing of uniforms by the Party's brownshirted stormtroopers — its paramilitary citizens militia — Goebbels mocked the ban by having the men march in public, costumed in stovepipe hats, paper caps, and similar items.

Another stunt he organized was a "debate" with Chancellor Heinrich Brüning. Because Brüning refused to participate, Goebbels "debated" an empty chair, responding — in Rush Limbaugh style — to a phonograph recording of a speech by the Chancellor. With wit and sarcasm, Goebbels "ironed flat" his colorless opponent — to roars of laughter from the mass audience.

Berliners loved such audacious spectacles, and showed their appreciation at the ballot box. In May 1928 Goebbels was elected as a deputy to the German parliament (*Reichstag*), and six months later was elected to the city council.

In 1929 Hitler named him director of propaganda for the entire National Socialist party, a demanding post of considerable responsibility. In spite of formidable and sometimes violent opposition — Party speakers were routinely banned, for example, and Hitler's voice was not permitted on German radio — the National Socialist movement grew rapidly during this period. By 1932 Hitler's Party had become Germany's most important, with by far the largest faction in the *Reichstag*.

The Party's vast propaganda and publishing empire — supervised by Goebbels — included 120 daily or weekly newspapers regularly read by about a million people across the country.

With a distinctly youthful leadership, the National Socialist movement was especially popular among younger Germans. For example, by the time Hitler became Chancellor, National Socialists had already swept the student council elections in

German universities.

On January 30, 1933, President Paul von Hindenburg named Hitler as Chancellor, entrusting the 43-year-old former First World War corporal with responsibility for governing an economically devastated nation on the verge of civil war.

Six weeks after the National Socialist "seizure of power," the 35-year-old Goebbels was named "Reich Minister for Propaganda and Popular Enlightenment." In this position, and as President of the "Reich Culture Chamber" (*Reichskulturkammer*), he exercised wide control over Germany's radio, film, newspapers, periodical press and book publishing, as well as over the nation's cultural life.

During the first years of the Second World War, 1939 to 1942, Goebbels' job as Propaganda Minister was relatively easy. With an almost unbroken string of German and Axis military victories, maintaining public morale was not difficult. His greatest challenge came during the final two years of the war, as Germany's armies suffered ever more terrible military reverses, her great cities crumbling into ruins under a growing storm of British-American bombings, and with utter defeat looming.

It was during this period that Goebbels' most dramatically proved his skill as a master molder of public opinion. In spite of the drastically worsening situation — both militarily and on home front — he largely succeeded in maintaining public morale, confidence in Hitler's leadership, and even hope.

Although German historian Helmut Heiber paints a highly critical and generally unflattering portrait in his biography, *Goebbels* (New York: Hawthorn, 1972), at the same time, he acknowledges Goebbels' talents and strengths.

He notes:

> [Goebbels] was able, until the very last minute, to encourage and exploit a blind trust in Hitler and his genius. It is indeed one of the macabre phenomena of the Third Reich that even in their country's agony the mass of the German people remained docile and faithful to Hitler's banner ... In spite of everything they had experienced, they kept the faith. [p. 133]

After the great defeat at Stalingrad in early February 1943, Goebbels was the first official forthrightly to acknowledge the seriousness of the peril that faced the nation and Europe, and frankly to concede that Germany could lose the war.

Probably the best known of his wartime speeches was his brilliantly crafted "Total War" address of February 18, 1943. Masterfully delivered to a large audience in Berlin's *Sportpalast* hall, it was broadcast on national radio and excerpts were shown in the weekly "*Deutsche Wochenschau*" newsreel.

On the morning of June 22, 1941, Dr. Goebbels broadcasts to the world the news that Germany has struck against Soviet Russia. He explains his government's reasons for the attack, the largest-scale military offensive in history to that time.

Speaking in the aftermath of the Stalingrad catastrophe, Goebbels stressed the grim truth that catastrophic defeat was a real possibility, and concluded with a rousing call for national mobilization. (Germany's national economy was still operating on a largely peacetime basis, with factories turning out a vast array of non-essential consumer goods.)

An enormous banner proclaimed the rally's slogan: "Total War, Shortest War."

Goebbels' frankness and even courage won him a measure of popular admiration. Writes Heiber:

> He understood the value of admitting reverses and even, now and then, errors; his readiness to be thus "candid" was a kind of knowledgeable wink at his audience — "Look, I take you seriously. Let's be frank with one another" — and enabled him to ensnare them all the more. The result was that later on, after 1943, after he had borrowed ... the "blood, sweat and tears" theme of Churchill, people were ready to believe in the ray of hope which he astutely let

shine through the somber coloring of his speeches. [p. 134]

"As other influential Nazis began to creep into their shells," comments Heiber, "Goebbels could dare to appear before a mob and not only gain a hearing, but even arouse faith and hope ..." [p. 134]

Joseph Goebbels (right) with armaments minister Albert Speer (left) and labor leader Robert Ley at a mass meeting in Berlin in 1943 to honor outstanding workers.

As the war dragged on, Goebbels' front-page editorial essays in the weekly paper *Das Reich* played an increasingly important role in sustaining public morale. They were widely reprinted and routinely read over the radio. "His articles in *Das Reich*," acknowledges Heiber, "were indeed excellent, brilliantly written, and full of bright ideas ..." [p. 235]

Heiber also notes:

> Goebbels' articles were carefully worked out more than a week before they were to appear, written in excellent, polished German, stylistically enjoyable and relatively discriminating in content; often they seemed illumined by the lofty wisdom of a great thinker. Their very titles were reminiscent of philosophical treatises: "On the Meaning of War," "The Essential Nature of the Crisis," "On the Work of the Spirit," "On Speaking and Being Silent," "The Indispensability of Freedom," "About National Duty in War." ...It is all very well turned and very solid. These articles made an impression, and Goebbels knew it. [p. 252]

Regrettably, little of what Goebbels wrote and said during the latter war years — when he was at the peak of his powers — has been translated into English.

One of Goebbels' greatest wartime propaganda achievements was his exploitation of the Katyn massacre story. In April 1943, the Germans discovered at Katyn, near Smolensk in occupied Russia, a mass grave of thousands of Polish officers who had been taken prisoner by the Soviets in 1939, and shot by Soviet secret police in April 1940.

On Goebbels' orders, German newspapers and magazines devoted great attention to the story, giving it weeks of detailed, often front-page coverage. His astute treatment of the story contributed significantly to a major Allied political defeat — a break in relations between the Soviet government and the Polish government-in-exile. (Meanwhile, American and British officials and newspapers backed the Soviet lie that Germans were responsible for the atrocity.)

In addition to his work as the nation's chief propagandist, during the war Goebbels took on ever greater organizational and policy-making responsibilities, playing an increasingly important role in keeping the nation's industrial and social machinery functioning.

In February 1942, Hitler entrusted him with special authority to oversee assistance to people ravaged in Allied air attacks — a post that was to assume ever greater importance as the aerial bombardment of Germany steadily escalated.

In the summer of 1944, Hitler named him "Reich Plenipotentiary for the Total War Mobilization." Thus, during the final catastrophic months of the war Goebbels — along with Armaments Minister Albert Speer — directed Germany's human and material resources for maximum war production, while simultaneously continuing somehow to operate the nation's electric power and water plants, transportation and telephone systems, food and fuel supply networks, public schools, radio broadcasting and daily newspaper publishing.

This organizational feat of keeping essential social and community services functioning, while at the same time maintaining and even sharply increasing armaments production — in spite of devastating aerial bombardment and an ever worsening military situation — is an achievement without historical parallel.

"We have become a people on the defensive," Goebbels wrote in *Das Reich* of Feb. 11, 1945 — eleven weeks before the end. "We work and we fight, we wander, we leave our homes, we suffer and endure, and we do all this with a silent dignity which, in the end, will arouse the admiration of the entire world. Europe may well be happy that it still possesses such a people. Today this people is the salvation of Europe. Tomorrow, therefore, it will be

Europe's pride."

His final radio address, broadcast over what remained of a tattered network, was delivered on April 19, 1945. As he had done every year since 1933, he spoke on the eve of Hitler's birthday.

Even on this occasion, when the terrible end was glaringly obvious to all, Goebbels still spoke with eloquent, controlled passion, frankly acknowledging the supreme gravity of the situation while inspiring hope. He had not lost his ability to rouse his countrymen with fervor as well as a certain seeming nobility.

From the balcony of his Propaganda Ministry building in Berlin, Goebbels on Nov. 12, 1944, addresses newly sworn-in members of the *Volkssturm*, a citizens' "home guard." This was part of a last desperate attempt to prevent Germany's total defeat at the hands of the Allies. Across the building a banner proclaims: "The *Volkssturm* Fights for the Life and Freedom of Greater Germany!"

"Do not let yourself be disconcerted by the worldwide clamor that will now begin," he urged in a letter written to his stepson just days before his death. "There will come a day, when all the lies will collapse under their own weight, and truth will again triumph."

In his final testament written just hours before he took his life, Hitler named Goebbels as his successor as Chancellor — a tribute to steadfast loyalty even to the bitter end. But Goebbels held this empty position for just a few hours. After he and his wife had their six children put to death, and with Soviet troops just a few hundred yards away, on the evening of May 1, 1945, Joseph and Magda Goebbels ended their lives in the courtyard outside the *Führerbunker*.

Contrary to popular belief, Goebbels was successful as a propagandist not because he was a master of the "Big Lie," but rather as a result of his fidelity to facts and truth.

As biographer Heiber notes:

> Goebbels was accordingly able to celebrate his information policy as being not only superior to the enemy's in its monolithic character, but also of a "seriousness and credibility" which "simply cannot be surpassed." The boast could be made with some justification: Seen in the long view, Goebbels preached, the best propaganda is that which does no more than serve the truth." [p. 254]

"Goebbels' real lies, his conscious lies, always pertained to mere detail ...," writes Heiber. "Goebbels' lies were more in the nature of those equivocations and evasions by which government spokesmen everywhere seek to 'protect' the 'national interest'." [pp. 134, 135]

It is also common to imagine that, however skilled, Goebbels was little more than a clever ranter who won support from his countrymen by appealing to base feelings of envy, revenge, conceit and arrogant pride.

This view, which implicitly demeans Germans as a nation of emotional and mental cripples, is especially widespread in the United States. If he thinks about it at all, the typical American imagines that if *he* had been living in Third Reich Germany, he would not have "fallen" for Goebbels' "obvious" lies.

Such a self-flattering view is based on ignorance. In his classic study, *Propaganda* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1968; Vintage, 1973 [p. 54]), French scholar Jacques Ellul pointed out that Goebbels' postwar image is itself a propaganda distortion:

> There remains the problem of Goebbels' reputation. He wore the title of Big Liar (bestowed by Anglo-Saxon propaganda) and yet he never stopped battling for propaganda to be as accurate as possible. He preferred being cynical and brutal to being caught in a lie. He used to say: "Everybody must know what the situation is." He was always the first to announce disastrous events or difficult situations, without hiding anything. The result was a general belief between 1939 and 1942 that German communiqués not only were more concise, clearer and less cluttered, but were more truthful than Allied communiqués (American and neutral opinion) — and, furthermore, that the Germans published all the news two or three days before the Allies. All this is so true that pinning the title of Big Liar on Goebbels must be considered quite a propaganda success.

As seen on "60 Minutes"!

America's most controversial and taboo-defying periodical!

"The Journal has an astounding record of fearlessly shattering the icons of those vested interests who hate and fear the truth. That is why I strongly endorse it, and suggest that every intelligent man and woman in America, Britain and the dominions subscribe." **—DAVID IRVING, best-selling British historian**

Defying powerful, bigoted special interest groups, ***The Journal of Historical Review*** boldly tackles suppressed and distorted historical issues — often highly controversial — that are making headlines around the world.

Appearing six times yearly in an attractive, handsomely illustrated, 48-page, full-sized magazine format, ***The Journal*** provides a rich selection of probing historical information, insightful analysis and thoughtful commentary.


The Journal of Historical Review
Volume Thirteen, Number 2
March / April 1993
Victor or Vanquished?
New Churchill Biography Sparks Furor
Greg Raven
Video Documentary Takes Aim at Holocaust Claims
David Cole
A Jewish Revisionist's Visit to Auschwitz
Legal Assault in France Against Faurisson
David Irving
The Suppressed Eichmann and Goebbels Papers
Martin A. Larson
Essene Origins of Christianity
—Reviews—
Jared Taylor's Paved With Good Intentions
Issah Nakhleh's Encyclopedia of the Palestine Problem
—And more—

Around the world, ***The Journal*** is eagerly read by discerning laymen and scholars who admire its taboo-smashing iconoclasm, its independent, thoughtful perspective on issues and events, and its uncompromising devotion to historical honesty.

Are you reading a borrowed copy of *The Journal of Historical Review?* Why not have your own copy delivered regularly to your home or office?

Subscribers to ***The Journal*** — which is a member of the Conference of Historical Journals — include university libraries and leading academic centers around the world. Since it began publication in 1980, it has been *the leading* periodical of its kind in the world.

A ***Journal*** reader typically has a keen interest in understanding how and why the world has become what it is today. He is fed up with recycled wartime propaganda being passed off as "history." He is tired of socially destructive lies and bigotry. He wants a sane and healthy future for himself, his family and his country, indeed for all humanity, and realizes that it can only be achieved through an understanding of history and the world based on truth and reality.

*Now, subscribers receive the **IHR Update** newsletter at no additional cost.*

So why not subscribe today, or give a gift subscription to a friend, local library or college library?

INSTITUTE FOR HISTORICAL REVIEW
PO Box 2739 · Newport Beach, CA 92659 USA · Fax 714-631 0981

Please enter my subscription to ***The Journal of Historical Review***:

❑1 year $40 ❑2 years $65 ❑3 years $90 (Add $10 per year for foreign subscriptions)

❑To support your work, I enclose a contribution of $_____

Name_____

Address_____ City_____ State _____ Zip_____

Please charge my ❑VISA ❑MasterCard ❑American Express in the amount of $_____

Card number _____ Exp. ___/____

Major French Magazine Acknowledges Auschwitz Gas Chamber Fraud

One of France's most influential and reputable magazines, *L'Express*, now acknowledges that "everything is false" about the Auschwitz "gas chamber" that for decades has been shown to tens of thousands of tourists yearly.

"Auschwitz: The Memory of Evil," a lengthy article by journalist and historian Eric Conan, a dedicated anti-revisionist, appears in the January 19–25, 1995, issue, pages 54–73 (and in the Jan. 26 international edition). *L'Express* is a liberal large-circulation weekly news magazine, similar in format to *Time* or *Newsweek*.

L'Express also reports that, after a five-year battle among the "experts," Polish president Lech Walesa has decided that the new, revised number of dead to be inscribed on the Birkenau monument will be 1,500,000. (For years the monument proclaimed 4,000,000 Auschwitz deaths.)

Generally speaking, writes Conan, there have been many obvious falsifications in the Auschwitz and Birkenau camp sites. Stefan Wilkanowicz, vice-president of the International Committee of the Polish government's Auschwitz State Museum (and director of an influential Polish Catholic periodical), says:

> The biggest blunders have been rectified but the principal discussions are never-ending and far from being settled. I can even say that essential debates, distressing, sometimes unexpected, are only beginning.

About the famous "gas chamber" in the Auschwitz I camp, Conan writes:

> In 1948, when the Museum was created, Crematory I was reconstructed in a supposed original state. *Everything in it is false* [*Tout y est faux*]: the dimensions of the gas chamber, the locations of the doors, the openings for pouring in Zyklon B, the ovens (rebuilt according to the recollections of some survivors), the height of the chimney. At the end of the 70s, Robert Faurisson exploited those falsifications all the better because at that time the Museum officials balked at admitting them. An American revisionist [David Cole] has just shot a video in the gas chamber (still presented as authentic): one may see him questioning the visitors with his "revelations" [Emphasis added.]

In spite of this, Conan goes on to report, there are no plans to alter anything there. With regard to the famous "gas chamber," a staff member of the Museum directors' office, Krystyna Oleksy, says: "For the time being we are going to leave it in the present state, and not give any specifics to the visitors. It is too complicated. We'll see later on."

Victory for Revisionism

This feature article in a leading French magazine is a great victory for Holocaust revisionism. On a key point, *L'Express* now acknowledges, the revisionists have been right all along.

In fact, the magazine concedes a point that revisionists have been legally penalized for making. Dr. Robert Faurisson, Europe's foremost revisionist scholar, was heavily fined after repeating it on numerous occasions during his "thought crime" trials in France. (Will the French government now prosecute *L'Express* magazine and journalist Conan for their revisionist Holocaust views?)

In May 1992 a German court fined David Irving 10,000 marks (about $6,000) for publicly saying what *L'Express* now openly admits. (See: "Irving Fined $6,000 in German 'Gas Chamber' Trial," *IHR Newsletter*, July–Aug. 1992, pp. 3–4.)

The court punished the British historian because he had told a Munich meeting in April 1990 that the structure in Auschwitz that has been portrayed for decades to tourists as an extermination gas chamber is a phony reconstruction ("*Attrappe*"), just like the one at Dachau.

Irving was found guilty of thus "disparaging the memory of the dead," a crime in Germany that effectively applies only to Jewish victims. In the case the Judge refused to consider any of the evidence presented by Irving's attorneys, including a plea to permit Dr. Franciszek Piper, Senior Curator and archives director of the Auschwitz State Musueum, to testify in the case.

Faurisson's Comment

Dr. Faurisson comments on Conan's article:

Clearly, the Auschwitz propagandists are at a loss. Oleksy's statement is an important vindication of the revisionist position. Every visitor of the Auschwitz "gas chamber" should confront the guides (or, if possible, Museum officials) with these sentences by Oleksy.

During a September 1992 interview with American revisionist David Cole, Auschwitz Museum Curator Piper said, "so now this gas chamber [at Auschwitz I] is very similar to this one which existed in 1941–1942."

As Conan knows, already in 1976 I demonstrated the falsehood of this entire story by questioning Museum official Jan Machalek, and by finding in the Auschwitz Museum files original plans clearly showing that, in fact, the alleged "gas chamber" was, between October 7, 1941, and August 31, 1943, a room with a single entrance where dead bodies awaiting cremation were stored.

If Museum officials now wish to rebuild the room as it was during the war, they will have to fill in the south-east doorway. After doing so, though, they would no longer be able to explain how the alleged victims entered the "gas chamber" for gassing. I do not think the officials would dare contend that the victims entered by way of the door of the ovens room.

For details on these points, see what I published in Serge Thion's 1980 book *Vérité historique ou vérité politique? La question des chambres à gaz*, pp. 316–317. I have also repeatedly mentioned the story of that "reconstructed" gas chamber in *The Journal of Historical Review* (see, for instance, Winter 1981 issue, p. 335), as well as during the 1985 and 1988 Zündel trials in Toronto (see, for instance, 1985 Trial, Transcript, pp. 2364–2366). Even as early as 1968, Olga Wormser-Migot wrote in her book *Le Système concentrationnaire nazi* (p. 157) that the Auschwitz I camp was "without a gas chamber." In 1985, Raul Hilberg stated under oath during the first Zündel trial in Toronto (Transcript, p. 774), and Pierre Vidal-Naquet wrote in *L'Allemagne nazie et le génocide juif* (pp. 510, 516, n. 94), what Franciszek Piper said to Cole in 1992. Jean-Claude Pressac told the same story in his 1989 book, *Auschwitz: Technique and Operation of the Gas Chambers* (pp. 108, 123, 133).

In his *L'Express* article, Conan mentions Jean-Claude Pressac's 1993 book, *Les Crématoires d'Auschwitz*. Among the fantastic number of "dossiers" and articles recently published in French newspapers and magazines in connection with the 50th anniversary of the camp's liberation, this article may perhaps be the only one to mention that book. Pressac's ambivalence has become an embarrassment for the "extermination-ists." For instance, his estimate in *Les Crématoires d'Auschwitz* (1993) of total Auschwitz deaths was 775,000 (rounded up to 800,000), and in the 1994 German edition he further reduced this to between 630,000 and 710,000 (of whom, he asserts, 470,000 to 550,000 were "gassed" Jews).

The Exposé that Shatters the Myth of Pope Pius XII's Complicity in the Holocaust

THE 'CONFESSIONS' OF KURT GERSTEIN

Author Henri Roques' doctoral thesis made world headlines in 1986 when, for the first time in the nearly eight-century history of French universities, a duly awarded doctorate was revoked by government order.

Henri Roques

What Roques had done was produce a closely argued thesis that struck at the very roots of the Holocaust story's credibility by challenging the "confessions" of SS officer Kurt Gerstein.

For the first time, the accusations of Gerstein—the enigmatic, twisted Third Reich functionary who claimed to have witnessed mass gassings of Jews in 1942—were subjected to thorough critical review. Roques' stunning conclusion: *not only are Gerstein's allegations of a mass extermination of Jews, and a Roman Catholic cover-up of the slaughter groundless, but postwar academics have deliberately manipulated and falsified key parts of Gerstein's tortured testimony.*

An indispensable resource for scholar and layman alike, ***The 'Confessions' of Kurt Gerstein*** provides transcripts and translations of all six versions of Gerstein's story, as well as photocopies of the originals; a searching examination of both the authenticity and credibility of the "confessions"; and numerous documents and records which have never before been published.

Had I been a member of the jury, I would probably have given a grade of "Very good" to Mr. Roques' thesis.
—Michel de Bouard, Institut de France

. . .From now on researchers will have to take his work into account. . .
—Alain Decaux, Académe Française

The 'Confessions' of Kurt Gerstein by Henri Roques
Translated from the French by Ronald Percival
Softcover • 318 pp. • Index, Charts • $11 + $2.50 postage
ISBN 0-939484-27-7
Available from
INSTITUTE FOR HISTORICAL REVIEW

Major Holocaust Polls Show Built-In Bias
Growing Skepticism of Extermination Claims Indicated

Greg Raven

In April 1993, just days before the opening of the US Holocaust Memorial Museum, newspapers across the country reported "chilling" and "startling" news: 22 percent of American adults surveyed in a major public opinion poll said they thought it was possible that "the Nazi extermination of the Jews" never took place.

An additional twelve percent of adult respondents in the survey — sponsored by the American Jewish Committee and conducted by the Roper organization — said they did not know if it was possible or impossible. (See, for example, "1 in 5 Polled Voices Doubt on Holocaust," *The New York Times*, April 20, 1993, and "Poll Finds 1 Out of 3 Americans Open to Doubt There Was a Holocaust," *Los Angeles Times*, April 20, 1993.)

Media Uproar

Distress and consternation were the most common reactions to the poll results. "What have we done?" asked a stunned Elie Wiesel, perhaps the premier Holocaust survivor. "We have been working for years and years," he said, commenting on the survey results. "I am shocked that 22 percent — oh, my God."

"Is lesson of hate getting through?" asked a headline to an essay in the *Milwaukee Journal* (April 22). "Ignorance about the Holocaust allows spread of lies to the young," claimed another item in *The News* of Port St. Lucie, Florida (April 28). An Associated Press piece — headlined "Many Americans doubt Holocaust happened" in the *The Washington Times* and "Holocaust denial seen gaining ground" in the *Los Angeles Times* (both May 8, 1993) — cited the impact of the Institute for Historical Review along with Bradley Smith's campus newspaper ad campaign and Dr. Arthur Butz's book, *The Hoax of the Twentieth Century* (published by the IHR).

Alarmed editorials in the *New York Times* (April 23) and the *Los Angeles Times* ("Dealing With Holocaust-Denial," April 22) cited the poll results to sound a call for yet more Holocaust memorials. A similarly distressed *Denver Post* editorial (April 25, 1993), cited the "intensely disturbing" poll results to demand even more classroom emphasis on the fate of Europe's Jews during the Second World War: "... Public schools must obviously do a better job of teaching 20th century history, even if it means giving shorter shrift to the Civil War or the Revolution. Today's students ... shouldn't be graduated if they can't recognize the names Auschwitz and Dachau as readily as Pearl Harbor and Hiroshima." (By contrast, results of a September 1994 poll showing that 46 percent of Americans aged 18–34 believe in the existence of UFOs did not lead to comparable nationwide calls for more school science courses or new science museums.)

Flawed Wording

As it turned out, however, the "startling" results of the AJC/Roper survey were not accurate. One of the poll's most serious flaws was the confusing wording of question 16, which produced the response that generated the most media comment: "Does it seem possible or does it seem impossible to you that the Nazi extermination of the Jews never happened?" The question's compound structure and double negative wording almost certainly confused many respondents. It is also likely that some of the 992 adults and 506 high school students surveyed may have believed that the Nazis exterminated millions of Jews but nevertheless agreed that it "seems" impossible.

Responding to criticism, the AJC recommissioned the poll, changing only question 16. In the second survey, this question was worded: "Does it seem possible to you that the Nazi extermination of the Jews never happened, or do you feel certain that it happened?" The results of the second, 1994 AJC poll were quite different: Only about one percent of Americans thought it was possible the Holocaust never happened, while eight percent were unsure. ("Poll on Doubt of Holocaust is Corrected," *The New York Times*, July 8, 1994)

While the revised 1994 survey suggested that Americans are far more accepting of the standard Holocaust extermination story than the first AJC poll had indicated, not one commentator responded with a relieved call for *less* emphasis on this subject

in classrooms, or *fewer* Holocaust memorials and museums.

Built-in Bias

Actually, the suggestive wording of key questions in each survey shows that the formulation of poll questions can produce skewed (and sometimes hoped-for) results. These polls also reconfirm what pollsters have long known: survey respondents tend to give answers they think are expected of them.

Given that the key question in each survey referred to "the Nazi extermination of the Jews" as an established fact, it was entirely to be expected that most respondents would accept the question's premise.

Bias was also reflected in other aspects of the two AJC/Roper surveys. The very first question in each was: "As far as you know, what does the term 'the Holocaust' refer to?" According to the booklet issued by the AJC explaining the 1993 survey, "If an incorrect response was given, respondents were told, 'To be precise, the Holocaust was the Nazi extermination of Jews during the Second World War'." (*What Do Americans Know About the Holocaust?*, by Jennifer Golub & Renae Cohen. New York: AJC, 1993, p. 14.) Thus, respondents were "primed" to answer subsequent questions in the "proper" way.

In the second AJC/Roper poll, "Of those with less than a high school education, 55 percent knew what the Holocaust was. This rose to 74 percent among high school graduates, 87 percent among college graduates, and 92 percent among those with advanced degrees." (*The New York Times*, July 8, 1994.) Given that up to 45 percent of the respondents were unable to identify the term "Holocaust" at the beginning of the survey, it is difficult, if not impossible, to see how 91 percent of respondents in this same survey could later be "certain that it ["the Nazi extermination of the Jews"] happened," without the poll-takers "correcting" the "incorrect" answers in the meantime. Given this slanted technique, the poll's results are hardly surprising.

These AJC polls also point up the sorry state of historical awareness among Americans. More than 22 percent of those surveyed did not know that the Nazis first came to power in Germany, and more than 13 percent did not know that Adolf Hitler was the leader of Nazi Germany. These results are consistent with other surveys showing that Americans cannot identify states and countries on a map, recall the decade during which the Civil War was fought, or cite the names of recent American Presidents.

Revisionist Outreach

Although it was not widely reported, the 1993 AJC/Roper poll confirmed that remarkably many

A BOLD BLOW AGAINST THE CONSPIRACY OF SILENCE



Timely, powerful, breathtaking. *This is a painful book to read, yet hard to put down. Its impact is profound. Let us hope that this important book does not itself become another victim of the conspiracy of silence, and that it gains the attention it deserves.*

—Richard J. Herrnstein
Professor of Psychology, Harvard University

THERE IS NO MORE COMPELLING ISSUE confronting Americans today than that of race. And yet there is no other issue in which the gap between private beliefs and public discussion is wider. Many Americans have succumbed to the notion that it is somehow wrong to be forthright about questions of race; that decent, intelligent people should not candidly discuss what's wrong; that the only acceptable debate must take place in an arena circumscribed by taboos.

Jared Taylor wants to reopen this debate. He believes that unless we can be forthright about race issues, unless we can ask the right questions and receive honest answers, we have little chance of solving the problem. And if we don't solve the problem, the race situation can only worsen.

This is the most important book about race relations in America to be published in a generation. It unflinchingly explores the failed consequences of laws and regulations that have turned the ideal of equal opportunity on its head, and it suggests approaches to festering social problems that today appear to be beyond our ability to remedy, or even grasp.

Paved With Good Intentions boldly argues that as long as whites are held chiefly responsible for the situation of blacks, policies such as affirmative action and quotas, perceived to penalize one group to reward another, will only make matters worse.

PAVED WITH GOOD INTENTIONS
The Failure of Race Relations in Contemporary America
by Jared Taylor
Cloth, 416 pages, Notes, Index
$22.95 + $3 shipping
available from
Institute for Historical Review
P.O. Box 2739
Newport Beach, CA 92659

Americans are being reached by the revisionist message. One survey question asked: "Some people claim that the Nazi extermination of the Jews never happened. Have you ever heard this claim, or not?" Thirty-eight percent of adults and 21 percent of students replied that they had heard this claim. Of those who had heard this claim, 59 percent of adults and 42 percent of students said they had heard it from television, 37 percent of adults and 14 percent of students had heard it through newspaper and magazine articles, and 14 percent of each group had heard it either from books or from acquaintances. (*What Do Americans Know About the Holocaust?*, pp. 54–58)

Moreover, such polls are themselves an indication of the spread and growing impact of Holocaust revisionism. If it were an entirely insignificant phenomenon, there would be no incentive to determine the number of people who accept or might be susceptible to the revisionist position. Publication of the results of such polls also enables more people to learn that a dissident view of the Holocaust story exists.

Other Surveys

Other recent "Holocaust" surveys — some of them more objective than the AJC/Roper poll — further confirm that Holocaust revisionism is now unquestionably part of the social-cultural landscape.

• In western Canada, after a newspaper article attacked writer Doug Collins for his views on the Holocaust story, *The Province* newspaper of Vancouver, British Columbia, asked readers, "Do you agree with Doug Collins that the Nazi Holocaust is exaggerated?" Out of 295 who called in to respond, 50 percent said that they agree. (*The Province*, Oct. 6, p. A14)

• In Georgia, nearly 19 percent "aren't sure that the Nazi Holocaust against the Jews occurred," according to a 1993 survey conducted by the University of Georgia Survey Research Center. Answering a separate question, nearly 20 percent think "the number of Jews killed by the Nazis, generally estimated at six million, may be inflated." (*Atlanta Journal/Constitution*, June 10, 1993, p. A8).

• In Idaho, a poll conducted in March by a Twin Falls television station asked viewers, "Do you believe that the Holocaust really occurred?" One in four participants in this survey answered "No." (See the July–August 1994 *Journal*, p. 43)

• A 1994 Gallup poll found that nine percent of Americans doubted "the Holocaust," which was defined as "usually referring to the killing of millions of Jews in Nazi death camps." (*New York Times*, May 20, 1994).

• In Italy, one in ten persons surveyed in 1992 by the Italian magazine *Espresso* believes that the Holocaust story is an "invention of the Jews." (See the Sept.–Oct. 1993 *Journal*, p. 29).

While the AJC/Roper polls indicated that better educated people are more likely to accept the Holocaust story — and to recognize its key components (Jews, Nazis, and the Six Million figure) — the Holocaust surveys cited here (most notably the one in western Canada) suggest the obvious point that the more people are aware of what revisionists actually say, the more likely they are to be skeptical of the orthodox Holocaust story.

Anti-Semitism Business

Even though numerous surveys show that anti-Jewish sentiment has been steadily declining in America in recent decades, the specter of anti-Semitism continues to serve as a proven fund-raising tool for groups such as the American Jewish Committee, the Anti-Defamation League, and the Simon Wiesenthal Center. With a vested interest in conjuring up the supposedly eternal danger of anti-Semitism, these organizations are in the anti-Semitism business.

By characterizing Holocaust revisionism, and even a lack of "concern" about the wartime fate of European Jewry, as anti-Semitic, groups such as the AJC — along with the major media — are able simultaneously to discredit revisionists, encourage non-revisionists to feel guilty for a lack of Holocaust "concern," and to present themselves as morally righteous fighters of evil and "hate." That could be one reason why the results of the second, 1994 AJC poll, which suggested much greater public acceptance of the Holocaust story, was not deemed as newsworthy as the results of the first AJC survey.

Good intentions will always be pleaded for every assumption of authority. It is hardly too strong to say that the Constitution was made to guard the people against the dangers of good intentions. There are men in all ages who mean to govern well, but they mean to govern. They promise to be good masters, but they mean to be masters.

— Daniel Webster

In Germany:

Book Detailing Jewish Crimes Against Germans Banned

Thousands of Copies of Revisionist Work Destroyed

Germany's cultural-political establishment no longer orders the destruction of "socially dangerous" literature in public bonfires. Today it resorts to more modern, environment-friendly methods to destroy "undesirable" books.

In February 1995, thousands of copies of a revisionist work detailing postwar Jewish crimes against Germans were destroyed, following bitter attacks by Germany's cultural establishment.

The book, *An Eye for an Eye: The Untold Story of Jewish Revenge Against Germans in 1945*, was published in the United States in 1993 by Basic Books of New York, a division of the reputable publishing firm of HarperCollins.

Written by American Jewish journalist John Sack, the work details the long-suppressed story of killing and mistreatment of Germans in brutal postwar prison camps in Poland.

Although the essential facts of Sack's book are quietly acknowledged by scholars, Germany's cultural and political establishment insists that Germans must not be permitted to read the work, citing fear that it could be "exploited" by "right-wing extremists" who play down the Holocaust story.

Typical was the comment of Ralph Giordano, a prominent German Jewish writer. While admitting that he had not read Sack's work, he dismissed it as "vulgar artistic fetish."

An influential German critic, Eike Geisel, bitterly denounced Sack's book as a sensationalist "vile docudrama" and a "gift to neo-Nazis." Geisel's Jan. 26 review, published under the headline "Anti-Semitic Fodder," provoked a barrage of complaints to the book's reputable Munich publisher, R. Piper.

All 6,000 copies of the already-printed German edition were stacked in a Stuttgart warehouse when Piper publisher Viktor Niemann decided to destroy them. "They will be recycled," Niemann said Feb. 13.

Citing information from Germany's Federal Archives, Sack writes that 60,000 to 80,000 ethnic Germans were killed or otherwise perished between 1945 and 1948 in camps run by the Polish communist regime's Office of State Security. Jews played a dominant role in the Office, as they did in similar agencies in other European countries occupied by Soviet Russia during the Second World War. Many of the prisoners were beaten and tortured to death, or died of typhus and other diseases.

Vastly more doubtless would have perished, but the great majority of Germans living in the areas that came under Polish Communist control had already left. Between 12 and 14 million Germans fled or were forcibly driven from their ancient homelands in what is now Poland, the Czech Republic and other parts of Central Eastern and Europe between 1945 and 1948. Of this number, about two million were killed or perished.

This is not the first time that Sack, a 64-year-old Jew from New York, has encountered such censorship. An American magazine, an American publishing house, and a German newspaper had earlier backed off from previous commitments to tell the story.

A key figure in Sack's book, Solomon Morel, fled to Israel last year from Poland after prosecutors began questioning him about his killings of Germans (and some Poles) in the Swietochlowice prison camp he had administered.

Prosecutors are weighing criminal charges against Morel, a Jew.

An Eye for an Eye — a 252-page hardcover work — is available from the IHR for $25.95, postpaid.

From Irving's Diary

My Confrontation with Deborah Lipstadt

David Irving

On Friday morning, November 11, 1994, my friend Martin O'Toole and I drove to DeKalb College auditorium [Decatur, Georgia], where Deborah Lipstadt [author of *Denying the Holocaust*] was due to speak. We were among the first to arrive, and as I struggled to carry in two large boxes of the paperback version of my 1989 book, *Göring,* we bumped into Lipstadt herself. She was speaking with the meeting organizers, and did not recognize me. I tucked myself away in one of the auditorium's exit corridors, then slipped into the room after she began speaking to the crowd of approximately 150 students. O'Toole already had set up his video camera on a tripod inconspicuously to one side of the auditorium.

Totally unaware that I was there, Lipstadt made several ugly references to me as somebody, "not really a historian," who had published several books but had earned no respect from other historians. In fact I was "not a respectable historian" at all. Earlier she had referred to [*Journal* editor] Mark Weber in the same terms, of [Liberty Lobby's] Willis Carto, and — pandering to the sizable black section

of the audience — of David Duke and his "white sheet and cone-head."

She talked of the eyewitnesses to the Holocaust™ at length though not in detail, and of the mounds of documents that exist to disprove the revisionists (a word she does not use; she calls revisionists "Holocaust deniers," and said she is proud to have coined the term). In particular she said that among the documents that refute the "deniers" is a "blueprint of a gas chamber complete with the openings through which the SS tipped the pellets of cyanide."

I estimate 75 percent of Lipstadt's speech was empty vaporings on the level of, "Those guys are denying the Holocaust. I won't debate them. I refuse to. Would you debate somebody who said the Earth was flat? Would you debate somebody who said sexual abuse of children was good? There *is* no debate." She returned to the child abuse theme at least five times in her meandering talk, prompting me to consider asking her whether by her obsession with child abuse she was trying, unconsciously, to tell us something about her own childhood.

Question time came. The first came from Georgia attorney Sam Dickson who, without any prearrangement whatsoever between the two of us, asked Ms. Lipstadt to explain why she is so disrespectful of me, given that I have such a distinguished record of literary accomplishments? She avoided giving a direct answer, suspecting that Dickson was a hostile. In fact, as soon as she deduced that he was not there to flatter her she snapped at him, "Get to a question or sit down."

I then politely put up my hand. Invited to speak, I boomed in my very British, very loud voice: "Professor Lipstadt, I am right in believing you are not a historian — you are a professor of religion?" She answered that she was a professor of religion but also of something in history. I then waded in with verbal fists flying: "I am the David Irving to whom you have made such disparaging reference in your speech. Given that I have 30 years' experience in the archives, that I have published some 30 books in the leading publishing houses of the world, including Viking Press, William Morrow, E. P. Dutton, and Avon in this country, what gives you the right to go around the world, including Australia and New Zealand (which visits she had mentioned proudly in her speech) blackening my name as though my opinions are of no consequence?" She became enraged and shouted at me to sit down or ask a question.

Still booming I continued: "You have just told an outright lie to these students. You are trying to dupe gullible students into believing that there are mounds of documents proving the Holocaust. You referred specifically to one, a 'blueprint of a gas chamber,' complete with 'the holes through which pellets were inserted.' I have here," holding up a handful of $20 bills, "a thousand dollars I will give you if you can produce to this audience, now or at any time in the future, this document about which you have just lied to them. One thousand dollars!"

What started as a pleasing "silent gasp" when I began my question and the students realized who I was, became an uproar. I then challenged her on those world tours: "Why don't you tell the audience who hired you to go around Australia and New Zealand! Who paid your fees?" She spluttered that she hadn't received any fee. I pressed on remorselessly: "Why don't you tell the students who paid your air fares to Australia and all around that continent, and who paid all your expenses. Because if *you* won't tell them, I will." I did not, however. By this time I could see adult staff running this way and that, obviously setting things in motion. Time to keep powder dry.

A black man sitting next to O'Toole, ten rows ahead of me and to the right, with his video camera running, chuckled, "Man, this is turning into fun." I called out, "I have here two boxes of my books (holding a copy of *Göring* aloft), which I am happy to give free to students, so they can see just who I am, and which of us is lying."

One or two students were hostile, but at least most of them were alert and awake. As Lipstadt began screaming into the microphone, I unrolled the 1944 aerial photograph of Auschwitz, and tried to show that the picture revealed no trace of the "two thousand tons of coke" that the alleged cremations (those to which Rudolf Höss "confessed") would have needed every day. I am not sure that students got this point in the mounting turmoil, however.

An armed security man had arrived, brought in by the organizers, and told me that if I would not agree to be silent, I would have to leave. I stood up and said loudly, "So! Professor Lipstadt not only refuses to debate with us, she has Security called to *prevent* any discussion." Dickson motioned to me to sit down. (He afterwards said I would probably have been arrested and held, so his counsel was welcome.) There were no serious questions after that. Several times I wagged the bundle of $20 bills aloft, as she was speaking, and hissed: "*One thousand dollars ...!*" When it was over, Lipstadt was livid about the outcome; the students dazed.

Then came the test: Would any of the students take the bait, and accept a free book? If the first student refused to touch it, they all would. But one man who had earlier gotten a copy of the book from me returned — even as Lipstadt was speaking — to ask for an autograph. I signed his book, and gave him four more to hand out. That "seeded" the audience nicely. After Lipstadt finished speaking, I was

mobbed by students asking for a copy. Victory! "I've only got seventy," I said loudly, "so there are not enough for everybody." Beneath Lipstadt's anguished gaze the students then formed another line to get their copies of the book autographed. Some students had me autograph copies of the printed invitation. As I did so, I noticed that each of them was blank, which meant that either they had not asked Lipstadt for her autograph, or she would have to sign after me.

O'Toole had been able to videotape the entire 90 minutes, getting Lipstadt on long focus and capturing my interventions, as well. Outside, I sat on a ledge, signing books, and lecturing the students on the Holocaust. One, looking like a junky, was hostile but even so I treated him with courtesy and patience. Another was Mia Daniels, a journalist for the DeKalb *Collegian*. I could see she was not writing down the favorable points I made. They learn young. The head of the German department asked for a book, but I was empty-handed by then. Shortly, one of the organizers bustled over to ask who had videotaped the event, and did we have a "release" signed by Lipstadt permitting this? O'Toole handed her his card and intimated that the video was needed as evidence in case Lipstadt libeled me or in case I was falsely accused of libeling her. The card read, "Martin O'Toole, Attorney at Law." On seeing this, the organizer blanched and withdrew.

But victory had not come cheap, what with air fares, car rental, and nearly a thousand dollars' worth of books donated to the audience. Still, not since April 1983 and the Hitler Diaries fiasco — not indeed since June 1977 and David Frost's failed television attempt to demolish *Hitler's War* — has success smelled as sweet, and been (in my view) so richly deserved.

Mattogno's New IHR Book Promoted on Radio Show

Auschwitz: The End of a Legend, the recently published book by Italian scholar Carlo Mattogno, has been receiving detailed and sympathetic attention on a radio talk show with a wide listenership in the western United States.

Russ Granata, a retired southern California teacher and US Navy veteran of World War II who played a crucial role in the translation, publication and promotion of the book, appeared on three occasions on the show, called "At a Glance." Host Rodney Bardin and Granata are old acquaintances.

During his first appearance in October 1994, Granata spoke about Mattogno's background, explained the importance of the widely-publicized writings about Auschwitz by French researcher Jean-Claude Pressac (which is the focus of Mattogno's book), and described a few of the points of contention between Mattogno and Pressac. Granata told listeners about the origins and development of Holocaust revisionism, mentioning the roles of Paul Rassinier, Harry Elmer Barnes, Arthur Butz and other revisionist scholars. Granata also spoke about the Institute for Historical Review (which published Mattogno's book in September), giving the IHR address and citing its bi-monthly *Journal*.

Reaching a listenership estimated in the hundreds of thousands, the pre-recorded program is broadcast on different days over four or five stations in southern California (including two in Los Angeles), New Mexico and Hawaii.

A few weeks later Granata returned as a guest to respond to letters received in the meantime from listeners of his first broadcast. He responded to the inquires, most of them thoughtful and several sympathetic, patiently and knowledgeably speaking about the Holocaust story, particularly regarding Auschwitz. He repeatedly cited Mattogno's book, and listeners were again told how to order it directly from the publisher. (Mattogno's presentation at the September 1994 IHR Conference, which summarizes the book's evidence and arguments, is published in the Nov.–Dec. 1994 *Journal*.)

In January Granata returned for a third appearance on "At a Glance," answering additional thoughtful questions from listeners. More than two dozen letters about the book had been received, Bardin said.

The evidence presented by Mattogno, said Granata, shows conclusively that the widely-repeated stories of homicidal gas chambers and "industrial mass killings" at Auschwitz, are "completely absurd." The Holocaust extermination tale, Granata went on, is technically and historically unfounded, and is therefore "simply not believable," It is the great taboo of our era.

Bardin cited letters of acclaim from listeners who had purchased and read the book. One reader, Bardin said, praised it as the "best Christmas gift I've ever received." Several times the IHR address was given out, so that listeners could order the book for themselves.

We Americans have no commission from God to police the world.

— Benjamin Harrison

Canadian Police Destroy Revisionist Book

Police in a western Canadian town have destroyed a public library copy of a Holocaust revisionist work published by the Institute for Historical Review. Apparently violating Canadian law, "Mounties" in the central Alberta town of Didsbury shredded a copy of *The Hoax of the Twentieth Century*, the CP news agency reported in late January.

A local high school student had borrowed the book from the town's public library, and then turned it over to police because, she said, her teacher told her it was banned. Librarian Tim Elliott said the police destroyed the book in apparent violation of Canadian law.

The police "said possessing the book was a criminal offense, and they would destroy it," Elliott recalled. "I then contacted Canada Customs, who said importation was illegal, but possession was not." Two days after the police first told him they had the book, Elliott tried to get it back. But "by then it was too late," the police "had already shredded it."

Under "hate literature" provisions of Canada's Criminal Code, police need a warrant to seize material they believe is offensive. Moreover, the owner must be given a chance to appeal the warrant before a judge. In March 1993, police officials in Ontario province, Canada's most populous, formally declared that "Holocaust denial" does not violate Canada's "hate law." (See the May–June 1993 *Journal*, p. 16.)

The Hoax of the Twentieth Century, written by Dr. Arthur R. Butz, is a key revisionist work that presents detailed evidence to refute the Holocaust story of six million exterminated Jews during the Second World War. Butz' book was first published in England in 1976. Tens of thousands of copies of the American edition, which has been published by the IHR in nine printings, have been sold over the years.

History, by apprising [men] of the past, will enable them to judge of the future; it will avail them of the experience of other times and other nations.

— Thomas Jefferson, *Notes on Virginia*, 1782



ON CAMERA Against the Holocaust Lobby

Dr. ROBERT FAURISSON ***DAVID IRVING***

MARK WEBER ***Dr. ROBERT COUNTESS***

On April 22, 1993, presidents and high-ranking officials of the United States, Israel and other countries gathered in Washington, DC to dedicate the new US Holocaust Memorial Museum. An army of journalists, cameramen and commentators was there to broadcast the media event to the world.

FAURISSON

IRVING

WEBER

IHR was there, too — there to declare its unequivocal opposition to this monstrous $160 million monument to flawed priorities and illicit power. On April 21 IHR held a conference at a hotel in a suburb of Washington, DC where 200 friends came to hear **Robert Faurisson** from France, **David Irving** from England, *JHR* editor **Mark Weber** and **Robert Countess** speak out against the Holocaust lobby. The event was captured on video, including, Prof. Faurisson's challenge to Museum officials that read, in part:

Tomorrow the US Holocaust Memorial Museum will be dedicated in Washington. I challenge the Museum authorities to provide us a physical representation of the magical gas chamber. I have searched for 30 years for such a representation without finding it . . . I warn the officials of the US Holocaust Museum . . . that tomorrow, April 22, 1993, they need not offer, as proof of the existence of Nazi gas chambers, a disinfection gas chamber, a shower room, a morgue, or an air-raid shelter . . . I want a portrayal of an entire Nazi gas chamber, one that gives a precise idea of its technique and operation.

Watch **Prof. Faurisson** deliver the complete text of his devastating challenge. Watch the inimitable **David Irving** thrill his audience with details of the Holocaust lobby's stepped-up efforts to crush truth in history. Watch **Mark Weber** deliver his rousing "call to arms" in opposition to the museum, and hear **Dr. Countess'** elegant tribute to the IHR — all in an unforgettable 90-minute video that tells you what you need to know about this costly and dangerous mistake they call a "museum."


CHALLENGING THE HOLOCAUST MUSEUM
Robert Faurisson • David Irving
Mark Weber • Robert Countess
Speak out against the Holocaust lobby
April 21, 1993 in Washington, D.C.

CHALLENGING THE HOLOCAUST MUSEUM
VHS Videotape • Color • 90 minutes
Item #V100 • $19.95 + $2 shipping, from
INSTITUTE FOR HISTORICAL REVIEW

Murder of Jews a Crime in the Third Reich



Todesurteil für Juden-Mörder

Das Reich gewährt allen Einwohnern Rechtsschutz. Das furchtbare Verbrechen in Bahn gesühnt

Stettin, 16. Dezember.

Das Schwurgericht Stettin verurteilte den Raubmörder Josef Reinhardt, der in der Nacht zum Bußtag mit zwei Komplicen in der pommerschen Kleinbahn Bahn den jüdischen Händler Abraham und dessen arische Ehefrau auf der Straße ermordet hatte, zum Tode. Seine beiden Komplicen, die Gebrüder Ickl, wurden zu lebenslänglichem Zuchthaus und zu sechs Jahren Gefängnis verurteilt. Der Vorsitzende betonte, daß es bei der Bestrafung der Schuldigen keine Rolle gespielt habe, ob der ermordete Händler Jude gewesen sei oder nicht. Das Dritte Reich sei ein Rechtsstaat, in dem der Jude ebenso den Rechtsschutz genieße wie jeder andere. Mord bleibe Mord und werde in jedem Falle mit den schärfsten Mitteln geführt.

Mit dem Todesurteil gegen Reinhardt ist der Schlußstrich unter ein grausiges Verbrechen gezogen. Der Mörder und seine Helfer hatten bei dem jüdischen Händler in der Nacht zum Bußtag für 230 RM. Kleidungsstücke gekauft. Als der Händler die Ware einpacken wollte, schoß Reinhardt ihn hinterrücks in den Nacken. Der schwerverwundete Jude lief dem Fliehenden nach, erreichte ihn noch auf der Straße, aber dort traf ihn der zweite, tödlich wirkende Schuß. Inzwischen war seine Frau, die sich schon schlafen gelegt hatte, hinzugeeilt, um ihrem Mann zu helfen. Als sie den Mörder festhalten wollte, schoß Reinhardt sie ebenfalls nieder, so daß sie tödlich getroffen auf dem Pflaster liegenblieb.

"Death Sentence for Murderer of a Jew. The Reich guarantees protection of law for all residents. Terrible crime in a train punished." Under these headlines, this report appeared in December 1937 in numerous German newspapers.

A jury court in Stettin, the paper informed readers, had sentenced Josef Reinhardt to death for killing a Jewish businessman named Abraham and his non-Jewish wife. One accomplice was sentenced to life imprisonment, and a second to six years imprisonment. The newspaper report continued: "That the victim was a Jew made no difference in passing sentence, the presiding Judge stressed. The Third Reich is a state of law, in which Jews enjoy the protection of law every bit as much as other residents. Murder is still murder, and will be punished most severely in each case."

Murder remained a crime during the war years. Paragraph 211 of the revised German penal code (published in October 1943), defined murder without any qualification about the victim's race, religion or nationality, and designated capital punishment for the crime. German military regulations were even more strict. The updated, 1943 code spelled out severe punishment for the soldier who carried out orders in violation of the law. "The subordinate ...is punishable as a participant...when he knows that the superior's order would have the aim of leading to a military or other crime or violation." (*New York Review*, Oct. 7, 1993, pp. 51–52.)

During the Nuremberg trial of 1945–1946, evidence was presented to show that German soldiers who had murdered civilians, including Jews, were severely punished. (IMT "blue series," Vol. 42, pp. 238–242.)

PERPETUAL WAR FOR PERPETUAL PEACE

A Critical Examination of the Foreign Policy of Franklin Delano Roosevelt and Its Aftermath

Edited by Harry Elmer Barnes

Quality Softcover • 740 PAGES • $18

ISBN 0-939484-01-3

Available From

THE INSTITUTE FOR HISTORICAL REVIEW

THE BALFOUR DECLARATION

Britain's Great War Promise

Few documents have had as shadowy a past, or as ominous a future, as the British government's 1917 pledge to the House of Rothschild. By it the British Empire broke its promise to the Arabs to court what it believed to be a far mightier power, and in the name of the Jewish people international Zionism won a foothold in Palestine.

Arthur Balfour's letter to Lord Rothschild – the culmination of years of intrigue – laid the foundation for the dramatic birth of Israel in 1948, for the dispossession of the Palestinians, for the five Israeli wars which followed, and for the gradual but ever deepening involvement of America in the Middle East morass.

Robert John's *Behind the Balfour Declaration* reveals the shadowy – and shocking – maneuverings which resulted in the British promise to the Zionists, and the secret document which exposes British perfidy. Dr. John, co-author of the monumental *The Palestine Diary*, and a specialist in Palestinian history, traces the moves by which Zionist negotiators like Chaim Weizmann and Louis Brandeis played off one empire against another to extract the guarantee that has changed the face of the Middle East and the world.

Behind the Balfour Declaration

The Hidden Origins of Today's Mideast Crisis

by Robert John

Softcover • 107 pages • Photos • $8 + $2 shipping from Institute for Historical Review

Punishment for Mistreating SS Camp Prisoners



Der Inspekteur der Kons.-Lager und Führer der SS-Totenkopfverbände — Berlin, den 4. Juni 1937

Befehlsblatt SS-TV/IKL Nr. 5

Mai 1937

Das Befehlsblatt wird am Schlusse eines Monats verteilt; in ihm soll Rückschau gehalten werden.
Den Einheiten ist der Inhalt beim Befehlsempfang bekannt zu geben.

Nr.29 : Mißhandlung von Häftlingen

Der SS-Oberscharführer Zeidler hat im Konzentrationslager Sachsenhausen infolge sadistischer Anwandlungen einen Häftling in gemeiner Weise geschlagen. Er wurde zum SS-Mann degradiert, für dauernd aus der SS ausgeschlossen und dem Strafrichter übergeben. Dieser Fall wird als warnendes Beispiel bekanntgegeben. Im Unterricht soll fortgesetzt auf die Folgen einer Gefangenenmißhandlung hingewiesen werden. Eine einfache Ohrfeige ist bereits vollendete Mißhandlung. Die Strafen, die ein Lagerkommandant über widerspenstige Häftlinge verhängen kann, sind so scharf und durchgreifend, daß es keiner Selbsthilfe bedarf. Das Ansehen der Schutzstaffel wird in allen Fällen durch die Ausstoßung des Täters rein gehalten.

Nr.30 : Befehlsblatt Nr.3 ist dem Aushängekasten zu entnehmen. Befehlsblätter 4 und 5 sind auszuhängen.

Der Inspekteur der Kons.-Lager und Führer der SS - TV .

gez. Eicke
SS - Gruppenführer

Für die Richtigkeit :
Der Chef der Zentralkanzlei SS-TV/IKL

SS - Standartenführer und Stabsführer.

In this June 4, 1937, internal circular notice, Theodor Eicke, SS General and "Inspector of the Concentration Camps," announces that the SS does not tolerate mistreatment of concentration camp inmates.

In a section headed "Mistreatment of Prisoners," Eicke announces that an SS Sergeant named Zeidler was being punished because, "in a sadistic mood," he had struck a prisoner at the Sachsenhausen concentration camp "in a nasty way." After demotion to the lowest SS rank, Zeidler was permanently dismissed from the SS, and then turned over to a criminal judge.

"This case will be made known as a warning example," Eicke continues. "During instruction classes, attention should repeatedly be given to the consequences of mistreating prisoners. Even a simple boxing of the ears is already real mistreatment... In every case, the reputation of the SS is to be kept clean by dismissing the culprit."

Eicke further orders that the various SS units are to be informed of the contents of this circular.

ESSENTIAL REVISIONIST READING ON THE HOLOCAUST STORY
Now More Than Ever!

The Hoax of the Twentieth Century
by Arthur Butz
Softcover. 369 pages. Photos. Maps. Bibliography. Index. $9.95

The Dissolution of Eastern European Jewry
by Walter Sanning
Softcover. 239 pages. Graphs. Charts. Bibliography. Index. $12.95

Auschwitz: A Judge Looks at the Evidence
by Wilhelm Staglich
347 pages. Photos. Maps. Bibliography. Index.
Hardcover: $19.95 — Softcover: $11.95

The Holocaust Story and the Lies of Ulysses
by Paul Rassinier
Softcover. 450 pages. Appendices. Index. $12.00

The Leuchter Report
by Fred Leuchter
(With a Foreword by David Irving and Introduction by Robert Faurisson)
Softcover magazine format. 66 pages. Numberous photos. Maps. $20.00

The Holocaust on Trial
by Robert Lenski
Softcover. 544 pages. Photos. Index. $29.95

Holocaust Revisionism is on the march, and the hard-pressed defenders of the orthodox Holocaust story are retreating. The forensic investigations conducted at Auschwitz by Leuchter and others, the drastic reduction in the official Auschwitz death toll, the release of previously-suppressed Auschwitz camp death records—all these developments signal the collapse of this century's most pernicious—and most politically exploited—myth.

These books—the most important works of Revisionist scholarship—remain as vital and as powerful as ever. That's why they are considered so dangerous by the enemies of free inquiry and historical truth, and have been banned in several countries. If you've read them already, why not make a gift of one or more of them to someone who hasn't?

Please add $2.00 per book for shipping. California residents please add 7.75% sales tax.

INSTITUTE FOR HISTORICAL REVIEW
P.O. Box 2739 • Newport Beach, CA 92659

Why Did a Great Egyptian Civilization Suddenly Collapse?

The Mysterious Demise of the World's First Socialist State

Revilo P. Oliver

We are so often assured that we live in a "changing world," and we are so pleased by the progress of our technology, that we sometimes imagine that change, or at least the rapidity of it, is a peculiarity of our time — an originality of which we are as proud as an adolescent who has discovered that he is in love.

The most drastic and rapid social change that mankind has ever experienced took place approximately five thousand years ago in Egypt. (I avoid the long discussion that would be necessary to set a more precise date or determine what was happening in Sumeria more or less contemporaneously.)

In terms of history, the change was sudden. A great Egyptologist, Professor John A. Wilson, had compared it to the speed with which a supersaturated solution crystallized in a flask. And it was drastic.

Within a century the Egyptians were hustled from barbarism to civilization. At the beginning of that period, they were roughly comparable to the Indians of our Southwest in their adobe villages before the coming of the white man: a timeless people, without a past to remember or a future to plan; a people for whom tribal mores took the place of formal government or social organization; a people that could live almost entirely by instinct, since the monotonous collection of food was varied only by an occasional raid on a neighboring village. At the end of that century, Egypt was a nation extending from the First Cataract to the Mediterranean, and subject to the absolute rule of a completely centralized and socialist government.

For the first time in man's long existence on this planet, there was a nation: and that nation's resources were consciously marshalled and used by government which necessarily planned for the future. Writing and written records appeared suddenly to make possible the bureaucracy that managed the nation. And the intelligent direction of human effort soon required or induced technical accomplishment. At the end of the Second Dynasty there was nowhere on the surface of the earth a permanent structure: Nothing had ever been built of stone. Within a hundred years Egypt had erected the most enduring structure that man has ever built — what was, until quite recently, both the tallest and the most massive building in the world. It was also one of the most accurately constructed: the two and a half million blocks of stone in the Great Pyramid were faced with blocks, many of them weighing sixteen tons, which were finished to a tolerance of plus or minus one one-hundredth of an inch.

When civilization had come to Egypt, it must have seemed eternal. It was, of course, designed, like the pyramids, for all time. For reasons made clear by Karl A. Wittfogel in his brilliant *Oriental Despotism* (New Haven, 1957), the earliest and most primitive form of civilized society is always socialism, with an omnipotent central government, a completely managed economy, and with inhabitants reduced to the kind of serfdom that our planners in Washington are now imposing, step by step, on the American people.

The Egyptians defined the good state as one in which "well directed are men, the cattle of God." Men were simply the cattle of Pharaoh, who had all the power that Jack Kennedy craved, and who was, by definition, the son of God and therefore God himself. He owned every acre of ground, every house, every stick of wood in Egypt from the First Cataract to the Mediterranean, and he naturally owned all the livestock on that plantation, both quadrupeds and bipeds.

A total socialism, such as Egypt had from the beginning, necessarily excludes all thought of change. That fact, indeed, may explain its appeal to men. The many hundreds of Utopias imagined by idle dreamers from Iambulos to Sir Thomas More to

---

Revilo P. Oliver, a scholar of international stature, taught Classics at the University of Illinois for 32 years. Until his recent death, he was a member of this *Journal*'s Editorial Advisory Committee. For more about Dr. Oliver, see the memorial tribute to him in the Sept.–Oct. 1994 *Journal*. This essay, originally written in 1963, is reprinted from pages 183–187 of *America's Decline: The Education of a Conservative*, a 375-page softcover anthology of Oliver's political writings that is available through the IHR for $10, postpaid.

Edward Bellamy differ greatly in all details, but have one thing in common: They imagine a state in which no governmental or social change is possible or even conceivable. And the sincere socialists of our own time, though vociferous in praise of "inevitable change" leading to socialism, promise us the joys of a social order that can never again change and will be immutable forever in saecula saeculorum — or, at the least, "'Til the sun grows cold, And the stars are old."

Necessarily, therefore, the basic assumption of Egyptian civilization was that it was a social order as eternal as the granite of its monuments. But four hundred years after Cheops built his pyramid, that order suddenly disintegrated into anarchy and utter chaos.

The one thing the we know with certainty about the causes of the collapse is that they were internal. Egypt was not invaded by a foreign people and was not involved in a major war or even any military action other than routine policing of the few points at which she was not isolated from the rest of the world by natural barriers. There appears to have been a steady trickle of immigration across the isthmus of Suez into Egypt, but there is no reason to suppose that the immigrants were sufficiently numerous and active either to affect the character of the Egyptian population or to attempt an insurrection.

When we look for internal causes, we note that the last king before the collapse, Pepe II, ruled for ninety years, which suggests that if he did not begin his reign as God in diapers, he ended it as God in senile imbecility, possibly inspiring one of his sons, grandsons, or great-grandsons with impatience to start enjoying the blessings of divinity himself. That is merely a guess that the spark which set off the explosion was struck by a civil war for possession of the throne. But whatever the source of the spark, it is clear that the explosive materials lay deep in the structure of the society they destroyed. Since a small body of literature, especially the lamentations of Ipu-wer and Nefer-rohu, who witnessed the collapse, has survived, modern historians can learn a good deal about the causes. You will find them discussed at length in any good history of ancient Egypt.

What happened in Egypt was not a mere political upheaval to change the ruler or form of government; it was the ruin of a whole civilization through the collapse of its moral foundations. "If three men go along a road," says Ipu-wer, "they become two men, for the greater number kills the lesser." "I show thee," says Nefer-rohu, "the brother as an enemy, and the man who kills his own father. Every mouth is full of 'Love me!,' and everything good has disappeared." Order had vanished in anarchy and universal banditry, and no man knew when he would be struck down from ambush or murdered in his own house.

The pyramid of king Khafre (Kha-f-Ra). This is the second-largest of the three great pyramids of Giza, which were built during the IVth dynasty, between 2686 and 2613 B.C. It has a perpendicular height of 447-1/2 feet. At the top a fragment remains of the original coating of limestone and unpolished granite slabs.

Yes, "his own house," for the lamentations incidentally show us that during the centuries preceding the collapse the perfect socialist state under its incarnate God had not been able to maintain its pure form; it had somehow progressed from socialism toward a higher form of social organization in which there was private property in practice and quite possibly even in theory. The writers take it for granted. Nefer-rohu complains that "Men take a man's property away from him, and it is given to him who is from outside. I show thee the owner in need and the outsider satisfied." And Ipu-wer: "The robber is now the possessor of riches ... The children of great men are dashed against the walls ... Great ladies now glean in the fields ... The owners of fine robes are clad in rags, but he who never wove for himself is now the owner of fine linen." It is clear

that Egypt had risen, though perhaps precariously, to a level far above pure socialism. That must have made the collapse the more terrible.

A great nation, which was coterminous with a civilization, had simply caved in. And since it had not been overthrown by an external force, the structure must have been poorly designed or poorly maintained. Or, to vary the metaphor, the culture had contained in itself the seeds of its own destruction. Or, perhaps, the civilization, like a dog, simply grew old and feeble and finally died. But whatever metaphor we use, the Egyptian collapse posed for us the basic problem of history. What were the causes of the collapse? And, since causes imply the existence of natural laws by which they operate, what laws of history can be inferred from them?



Egyptian stonecutters use mallets and chisels to dress down building blocks to true surfaces. These blocks are similar to those used in building the great pyramids. After two edges of the block are determined, a cord is stretched between two pegs to help gauge how much remains to be chiseled away. (From a wall painting at Thebes about 1500 B.C.)

The Egyptians either violated some natural law that applied to civilizations, and could therefore have averted the collapse had they been more prudent, or they underwent a change that was "historically necessary" because imposed by some natural law that human ingenuity cannot circumvent. That alternative simply states the central problem that a philosophy of history must solve. And since we are subject to the same natural laws, the problem is vital and urgent.

Of course, Egypt eventually recovered from the chaos that historians euphemistically call the First Intermediate Period; and she went on to complete with many vicissitudes her three thousand years as a great and independent nation — a record that only China can rival. But the men who witnessed the collapse could not foresee that. The apparent end of human civilization, overthrown by a barbarism made more savage and terrible because it had captured the weapons and resources that civilization had produced, must have been a traumatic shock unsurpassed (thus far) in the experience of mankind. Contemporaries felt utter despair. "The land is completely perished, so that no remainder exists," concluded Nefer-rohu. And Ipu-wer could only regard mankind as a failure and wish that it would disappear: "Ah, would that it were the end of men! That there were no conception and no birth! Then would the earth cease from turmoil and be at rest."

But it did not occur to either Nefer-rohu or Ipu-wer — nor, so far as we know, did it occur to any later Egyptian — to ask why the catastrophe had befallen them. That may be a very significant historical datum.

It is not at all astonishing that the two Egyptian writers, with no precedent or record of comparable human experience to guide then, did not see in the cataclysm an intellectual problem. Nefer-rohu was right when he said, "What had never happened had happened." But it seems that at no time in their long existence as a nation did the Egyptians think in terms of historical cause and effect. They compiled chronologies, but they never wrote history. They kept careful record of the sequence of events, but did not try to explain them. Some years brought national misfortune, just as the Nile in some years did not rise to its normal height and the fields consequently bore but a scanty harvest. Such things happened; if they had a cause, that cause lay in the mysterious and perhaps capricious will of the gods, far beyond human understanding.

PEARL HARBOR

The Story of the Secret War

by George Morgenstern

Hailed by Revisionist giants Barnes, Beard, and Tansill when it appeared shortly after World War II, this classic remains unsurpassed as a one-volume treatment of America's Day of Infamy. Morgenstern's *Pearl Harbor* is the indispensable introduction to the question of who bears the blame for the Pearl Harbor surprise, and, more important, for America's entry through the "back door" into World War II. Attractive new IHR softcover edition with introduction by James J. Martin. 425 pp., index, biblio., maps, $14.95 + $2.50 shipping.



Estonia: Emerging From Communism

YURI N. MALTSEV

Post-communist history has been a chronicle of economic failures, ethnic wars, and political upheavals. But in the midst of all this gloom, one success story had been completely overlooked. Its name is Estonia, which could be called "the little country that could."

Estonia has made an incredible transition from Soviet slavery to economic liberty, and it serves as proof that free markets are the only sure way out of Communist serfdom.

During the period while it was ruled by the Soviet Union (1940–91), Estonia's 1.5 million people faced unthinkable economic coercion and political brutality. The central government attempted to suffocate national and religious identity, and independent political thought. In short order, Kremlin planners destroyed one of the most prosperous countries on earth.

And they did not do it without the blessing of the US government, then headed by Franklin Delano Roosevelt. It was FDR who suggested to Stalin that he solve the "problem" of Baltic political resistance by forcibly moving the populations of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania to Sweden. This "ethnic cleansing" would have wiped away three nations with rich cultural heritages, solely to please the mass murderer in the Kremlin.

Interestingly, this deal was rejected by Stalin, who did not want to have millions of discontented Balts on the Soviet border. His alternative was to transport tens of thousands of leading Estonians to gruesome death in the Gulag. More than one hundred thousand Balts perished in Siberia.

After all this, Estonia regained its independence on August 20, 1991, after the failure of the hard-line Communist coup in Moscow. Since then, the country has been at the forefront of political and economic reforms in Eastern Europe. It set out to reverse completely the errors of the past.

Estonia moved quickly to rebuild Western principles of the rule of law. It privatized state land and industry at an unprecedented pace. It repealed all price controls. It legalized all forms of market production and exchange which had flourished only in underground markets. It attracted foreign investments by adopting low taxes and protecting property and other human rights.

It did all this against the advice of international planning agencies. As a result, Estonia has not been a favored recipient of foreign aid. The president of Estonia says that is just fine. No country dependent on foreign aid has become prosperous. And today, this small nation can boast the highest rates of economic growth in Europe (more than five percent) and very low unemployment.

The high Soviet inflation rate was reigned in by a hard currency and sound monetary policies. In June 1992, Estonia replaced the Russian ruble with the Estonian kroon, a hard currency tied to the German mark. The kroon is pegged to the D-mark at an exchange rate of eight to one, as well as to Estonia's gold reserves, which back no less than 25 percent of the money supply.

Today Estonia has the strongest and most stable monetary regime of any of the 15 former Soviet republics. The average level of inflation is down to a monthly rate of less than one percent, compared with 30 percent in Russia. The government is committed to a hard money regime, not only because it provides economic stability but also because it works as a restraint on government growth.

Estonia maintains a liberal trade regime with practically no tariffs. Companies operating in Eastern Europe point to Estonia as being five years ahead of other East European countries, and investment advisers consider it the emerging Hong Kong of Europe. Foreign investment is growing annually by some $250 million.

The new class of Estonian leaders, in the private sector and the government, is comprised of young people, who are well educated in free-market economics. The present government was formed by the conservative-libertarian *Pro Patria* ("For the Fatherland") Party. Other factions in Parliament are the Royalists, Moderates, and Centrists. (There is no Socialist or Communist Party.) All parties are committed to continuing reforms and to further privatization.

"We don't want to copy welfare monsters like Sweden and our other Northern neighbors," Prime Minister Mart Laar told me. Laar is 33 years old, a University of Tartu professor well acquainted with the works of Ludwig von Mises, F.A. Hayek, and the other Austrian School economists. Recently he was turned away by a security guard in Brussels. "I don't believe you could be a prime minister anywhere," said the guard in reference to his youth.

The unofficial slogan of the governing party is: "Property rights are the key to economic success, cultural revival, and political freedom." The Foreign Office spokeswoman says "It is a privilege to be

---

Yuri N. Maltsev, a native of Russia, escaped from the Soviet Union a few years before its downfall. He is associate professor of economics at Carthage College (Kenosha, Wisc.), and a senior fellow of the Ludwig von Mises Institute (Auburn, Ala. 36849-5301). This essay is reprinted from the Nov. 1994 issue of *The Free Market*, a monthly newsletter published by the Mises Institute.

working with people who want to be to Estonia what Thomas Jefferson and George Mason were to America." She believes government should be strong enough to protect liberty and property, but not one bit more. She points out that privatization and property rights enforcement have already created a strong middle class.

Estonia

Estonia, a small northern European nation on the Baltic sea, has a population of 1.59 million. Only 17,400 square miles in size, the country is smaller than West Virginia. A non-Slavic and traditionally Lutheran people, Estonians are close ethnic and linguistic relatives of the Finns.

In 1918, at the close of the First World War, Estonia was proclaimed an independent republic. In 1934 President Konstantin Päts instituted an authoritarian regime, abolishing all political parties. The 1918–1940 independence era was marked by rapid economic growth and a dramatic rise in living standards, with large exports of grain and dairy products. Between 1931 and 1938, for example, exports more than doubled. In the industrial field perhaps the most important single achievement was the creation of an oil shale industry, whereby oil and petroleum fuels were extracted from oil-bearing shale.

In August 1939, Hitler's Foreign Minister, von Ribbentrop, and Stalin's Foreign Minister, Molotov, concluded the German-Soviet Non-Aggression Pact, which divided Eastern Europe into German and Soviet spheres of influence. Estonia and the other Baltic countries were assigned to the Soviet sphere. However, contrary to often-repeated characterizations of the Pact, the Hitler government neither anticipated nor approved of Stalin's subsequent outright annexation of the Baltic countries.

Soviet troops brutally ended Estonia's period of national freedom in the summer of 1940, when the country was forcibly incorporated into the USSR. During the 1940–1941 period, many political, business and religious leaders were killed or deported. Civil servants, non-Communist political leaders, army officers, judges, clergymen and businessmen were particular targets. In 1940–1941, some 120,000 Estonians — about one-tenth of the entire population — were rounded up by the Soviet secret police and deported to Gulag camps, where many perished.

In 1941 German troops liberated Estonia — along with the neighboring Baltic countries of Latvia and Lithuania — from Soviet rule. As part of the "Ostland" region — which also included Latvia, Lithuania and Belarus (White Russia) — it remained under German occupation until 1944.

Estonian nationalism was encouraged during this period, and many young men volunteered to fight with the Germans against the Soviets, most notably in the Estonian Waffen SS.

As Soviet troops advanced, many Estonians fled the country. About 33,000 escaped with the retreating German forces to Germany, and another 30,000 went by sea to Sweden.

The restoration of Soviet rule brought further mass arrests and deportations: some 20,000 Estonians were rounded up and sent to camps in 1945–1946, and about 40,000 were deported in March 1949. Still, even under Soviet rule, Estonia was more economically successful and prosperous than other regions of the Soviet Union.

As part of the Soviet "multicultural" policy, people from other parts of the USSR were encouraged to settle in Estonia. As a result, today only about 60 percent of the country's population is ethnically Estonian. Only Estonians are now permitted to vote in elections, which means that about 38 percent of the population — mainly ethnic Russians — play no role in political life.

— M. W.

When preparing your will or trust, please consider a bequest to the Institute for Historical Review.

For information, write:
Director, IHR
P.O. Box 2739
Newport Beach, CA 92659

Reviews

'Fuss and Flapdoodle' About Pearl Harbor

Pearl Harbor: Final Judgement, by Henry C. Clausen and Bruce Lee. New York: Crown, 1992. Hardcover. 485 (+ x) pages. Photos. Notes. Appendices. Index. ISBN: 0 517 58644 4.

Reviewed by James J. Martin

The fourth of the ten (some students combine two and come up with nine) investigations of the Pearl Harbor attack of December 7, 1941, was the result of an authorization by the United States Congress. A Senate Joint Resolution of June 13, 1944, directed the Departments of the Army and Navy to conduct their own investigations, which was promptly followed by the Secretaries of these Departments appointing personnel to conduct such investigations and the beginning of hearings, which were to take awhile.

The Army Pearl Harbor Board (APHB) consisted of three Generals plus a supporting staff of three, an Executive Officer, a Recorder, and an Assistant Recorder, the latter three having no vote in the Board's final disposition. The Assistant Recorder was a 39-year-old San Francisco lawyer, Henry C. Clausen, who had come into the army two years earlier, ostensibly by taking a commission, not as a draftee foot-soldier. How the lightning had managed to strike Clausen for appointment to such a crucial job no one ever explained, but anyone who has gone over the repeated citations in later years of Clausen's heated admiration of War Secretary Henry L. Stimson, which had not abated even 50 years after his entry into the armed services, can probably figure it out for themselves.

The findings of the APHB, which have been exhaustively examined for more than four and a half decades, take months to read. Charles A. Beard alone devoted parts of three chapters of his 1948 book, *President Roosevelt and the Coming of the War 1941*, to such an examination, and there are numerous somewhat shorter analyses and commentaries on it all. For our purposes it is sufficient to observe that the Board came to conclusions which angered the Secretary of War and led to a determination to undermine its findings, even if it required that pressure be placed on some of its witnesses to recant sworn testimony making them, in substance, perjurers.

What the Board did was to reverse the flow of criticism for what had happened, away from the Army and Navy commanders at Pearl — which had been the original desire of the authorities in Washington — and once more to direct it at the superiors of those in Hawaii who took orders. This therefore required the top people in Washington to put into effect a comprehensive program of Pearl Harbor responsibility damage-control; it is here that we find Atty. Clausen as chief of the cast of characters in the book at hand.

When the APHB singled out Secretary Stimson's direct subordinate, Chief of Staff General George C. Marshall, as responsible for the Army not being ready to defend the fleet based at Pearl Harbor on the morning of December 7, 1941, they angered the Secretary. That and other charges convinced Stimson that something had to be done to soften the Board's verdict and once more lay the blame elsewhere. For the first two and a half years the sentiment had been well established by the first big political investigation, conducted under the direction of Supreme Court Justice Owen J. Roberts (Dec. 18, 1941 to Jan. 23, 1942). It found that all in Washington were innocent of any dereliction of duty, and that the Army and Navy chiefs on Oahu, General Walter C. Short and Admiral Husband E. Kimmel, had failed comprehensively in following orders and repelling the Japanese attack.

Few realized that Justice Roberts (b. 1875), like the War and Navy Secretaries, Stimson and Frank Knox, respectively, was a Republican, appointed to the Supreme Court by Roosevelt's predecessor, Herbert C. Hoover, and had begun his Court service on May 30, 1930. (It was a disgrace for Congress later to conduct an investigation of Pearl on a partisan basis; the pro-war Roosevelt Democrats had as allies a very large contingent of pro-war Republicans, without whom FDR's war effort would have

---

James J. Martin graduated from the University of New Hampshire in 1942 and received his M.A. (1945) and Ph.D. (1949) degrees in History from the University of Michigan. His teaching career has spanned 25 years and involved residence at educational institutions from coast to coast. Dr. Martin's books have included the two-volume classic, *American Liberalism and World Politics, 1931–1941*, as well as *Beyond Pearl Harbor*, *The Man Who Invented 'Genocide': The Public Career and Consequences of Raphael Lemkin*, and *An American Adventure in Book-burning in the Style of 1918*. He is also author of two collections of essays: *Revisionist Viewpoints* and *The Saga of Hog Island and Other Essays in Inconvenient History*. Dr. Martin has contributed to several editions of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, and is a three-time contributor to the *Dictionary of American Biography*.



Major US Navy war ships in "battleship row" at Pearl Harbor, Hawaii, settle to the bottom following the Japanese attack on the morning of Dec. 7, 1941.

been impossible. The war homogenized the parties and turned the country temporarily into a one-party state.)

It should be understood, especially by those who were not around at the time, that there was no Defense Department in 1941, and no coordinated military operation as represented by the Pentagon today. The Army and Navy had separate secretaries in the Cabinet, and conducted their affairs separately unless, obviously, operating by agreement or under direction of the President. Each branch also had its own separate air forces. There had been talk for years before 1941 of consolidation into what was to become the Department of Defense after 1945. In congressional debate it had been posed as an economy move ("it will save many millions"), and there had been especially heavy debates on it in the House of Representatives in the spring of 1932. It was thought strange that the Hoover administration opposed it while at that moment creating a thunderous stir in admonishing Congress to balance the budget. (See the major roundup of US press sentiment on it in the lead story in the *Literary Digest*, May 21, 1932, pp. 5–6).

But nothing had been done by war's outbreak, so there is an aspect to the Pearl investigations that many today do not understand or appreciate: the rival views on responsibility with respect to the branches of the armed services, the defensiveness of both, and the partisanship among the politicians in ascribing more of the onus to one or the other, which fills the investigative reports and wearies the readers thereof. (In a caste society every caste becomes morbidly sensitive about its position, and this grows out of the possible change in esteem in which it is held, which may markedly alter that position. The armed forces certainly qualify as castes in this controversy.)

The Army Pearl Harbor Board conducted its investigations in secret, listened to 151 testimonies and filed a secret report, which was made public after the end of the war in the summer of 1945, by which time Mr. Roosevelt was deceased and had been followed in office by Harry S. Truman, who was responsible for making this a public disclosure. At the conclusion of this investigation — carried out from July 20 to October 20, 1944 — its finding became known almost immediately to Secretary of War Stimson, who put into operation the follow-up damage-control counter-investigation by his handpicked agent, Major Clausen, who in turn began his repair work less than five weeks later (Nov. 23, 1944). It is how this incredible operation was conducted which is the main subject of the book at hand, though it is fattened by an immense set of appendices which give it the appearance of greater formidability than it really has.

Attorney Clausen's final product was a masterpiece of self-serving (it constitutes Volume 35 of the subsequent Congressional investigation's published record), while adding a succession of glowing haloes around his adored chief, Secretary Stimson. One flees for balancing relief to Prof. Richard N. Current's *Secretary Stimson: A Study in Statecraft* (Rutgers Univ. Press, 1954, a frightfully neglected book), and a long succession of drastic discounting and appraisals of Stimson for various periods ranging from his performance as President Hoover's Secretary of State, 1929–33, to his central role as point man of the warrior Republicans who made FDR's War Deal such a triumph, 1940–45 *et seq.* (Mr. Stimson also served as Secretary of War in the administration of President William Howard Taft after his failure to become Governor of New York in 1910.)

Attorney Clausen and the historians would make a topic for a hundred thousand word essay. While claiming to have read them all, he considered them all ignorami, though producing no evidence whatever in support of this assertion. They in turn originally appraised attorney Clausen's mission as nearly worthless, and his attempt to derail the Army PH Report a weak and unconvincing diversion. What draws attention in his nearly 50 years-after-the-fact dictum in *Judgement* is his savaging of Navy people on Pearl, which is really none of his business, while dodging entirely the Army responsibility for defending the Navy when it was berthed there. The work of 21 revisionists from John T. Flynn to John Toland (1945 to 1982)) is 100 percent missing from Clausen's "final" dictum, and none of the other contemporaries are even worth mentioning. The ugly meanness of shrugging off all responsibility and splattering it all over underlings acting on the orders of these whitewashed superiors makes its mark on a reader with some perception of Amer-

ican traditions of fairness. One hesitates to say much in the presence of this shameful parade.

Before coming to any permanent conclusions a revisionist for sure needs to digest thoroughly five other basic treatments of it all, from contemporaries of Clausen to recent times. These are:

1) the pertinent parts of Chapters 9 through 12 of Charles A. Beard's *President Roosevelt* (1948);

2) the analysis of the Clausen mission by George Morgenstern in his *Pearl Harbor* (1947) and

3) by Percy Greaves in his chapter on the Pearl Investigations in *Perpetual War for Perpetual Peace* (1953);

4) the overall situation succinctly laid out in *The Final Story of Pearl Harbor* (1968) by Harry Elmer Barnes, and

5) the assemblage of later-revealed important materials in John Toland's *Infamy* (1983 ed.).

All of Clausen's fuss and flapdoodle in getting people to alter their previous testimony about who saw, and when they saw the 13-part Japanese diplomatic message of the afternoon of December 6, 1941, is today just so much bound waste paper. What difference does it make what Army men did or did not see it after 6 p.m.? President Roosevelt certainly saw it by 10 p.m. that night and commented in the presence of witnesses, "This means war," and in view of American-Pacific strength concentration in Hawaii that moment, FDR surely did not mean that Ottumwa and Kankakee were in danger. Why was nothing done for more than twelve hours after that? Stimson and Marshall were veritably at his elbow. Who besides the President was at the White House that night or most of that night? Does anyone know? Where was the chief executive of the Army, Gen. Marshall, for almost 24 hours after noon of Dec. 6, 1941? Clausen does not investigate these matters, but after all, as he repeatedly observed, he had not been appointed to investigate the investigators. And at no time did he claim to be a historian.

In the "case" of the Army PH Board *vs.* Stimson, Marshall *et al* it was hard to discern who were the plaintiffs and who the defendants, but Clausen performed mightily in behalf of the Administration figures. As a lawyer devoted to his client he was not interested in history. He was committed to making an *ex parte* collection of "evidence" or any kind of diversion which would redound to the credit of his adored chief Sec. Stimson, and hopefully at the same time discredit the APHB Report that implicated Stimson via Gen. Marshall for responsibility in failing to defend the US Fleet in Pearl Harbor on Dec. 7, 1941, while at the same time planting the guilt once more, *a la* the Roberts Report, on the operational commanders at the scene, an ignoble and reprehensible stratagem if ever there was one.

This ancient game of saddling underlings for the responsibility when big plans and high strategy collapse and bring about disaster, was a sordid and unappetizing activity utterly lacking in basic decency. But it was the Army itself that had come down on Stimson and Marshall, after all, not some awful revisionists. (Atty. Clausen calls the latter "isolationists.")

Secretary of War Henry Stimson speaks with Army Chief of Staff General George Marshall.

For someone who has gone over the substance of this work as often as this reviewer, much of this book is truly tedious. Perhaps this estimate of Clausen's book should have been done by someone utterly ignorant of it all, as had been the case with some of the newspaper reviews, in which case they might have been able to approach the assignment with some kind of breathless sense of discovery.

There is no use to pile example upon example, but one might mention the famed "war warning" to Gen. Short of Nov. 27, 1941, about which a veritable library of analysis and comment exists. Beside what is at hand, revisionists should surely examine this set of contradictory advisories in Chapter 8 of Prof. Current's *Secretary Stimson*, "The Old Army Game," and Chapter 16 of Morgenstern's *Pearl Harbor*, "The 'Do-Don't' Warnings."

How Gen. Short could put the base on a semi-attack alert and a sabotage alert simultaneously, conduct long range reconnaissance by air without planes of flying range to do the job, and how he could encompass other precautions without unduly exciting and arousing the civilian population of Honolulu surely tax almost anyone's sense of the rational. For instance, there was the major coastal artillery base, Fort DeRoussy, not at Pearl but six or more miles away, smack up on the fringe of the big resort hotels on Waikiki Beach. How Gen. Short could have sent in a fleet of Army trucks loaded with shells to arm these big guns without creating a mild hysteria among the Honolulu civilians, who could not have missed witnessing all this, escapes all understanding.

And if Clausen had made even the barest effort at keeping abreast of what had been done on the subject other than by himself, he and his co-author could have saved themselves the embarrassment of the final appendix to their book, "The 'Winds Code'" (pp. 447–470). This reprinting of what the politicians had done to Capt. Safford as the lasting line on the "East Wind, Rain" message is almost beyond comment. Those in the congressional hearings who mauled Safford repeatedly for his stubborn insistence such a message had been received at least three days before the attack on Pearl conducted what was probably the ugliest and most dishonest campaign ever carried out in public against a member of the US armed forces. It is very likely that at least one of them knew such a message had been received, and probably that there had been several other receptions.

The question of whether Capt. Safford had received this message or not is central to the most sacrosanct Establishment tome on Pearl, Roberta Wohlstetter's *Pearl Harbor: Warning and Decision* (1962). However, this matter was blown away more than 15 years ago by the revelations of Navy War-

US and Soviet Intelligence in Pre-Pearl Japan

For a quarter of a century this writer has been aware of a buried theme in Pearl Harbor revisionism that so far has had virtually no written accompaniment. It is a mixture of suspicion and conviction that the United States via one or another of its civilian agencies or armed forces had a formidable intelligence service planted in Japan, perhaps for a decade before December 7, 1941, and knew well in advance of the usual official line on the subject when the Japanese fleets left port to bring their air force to bomb Pearl, and to attack and invade the Philippines two days later.

The Soviet Union had such an operation, as those who have read one or another of the many accounts of Richard Sorge may recall. Japan had a well-disciplined Communist Party founded in part by the legendary Sanzo Nozaka (1892–1993) as far back as 1922. He had spent most of the war years involving Japan and China at the headquarters of Mao Zedong and the Chinese Communists in Western China. In fact, the Stalinist spy ring had even been successful in planting a Japanese Red, Hotsumi Ozaki, in the Japanese Cabinet itself. It is most unlikely that only Stalinist Russia had a spying operation in Japan.

In the lengthy, almost-400 word footnote by Toland on p. 272 of the 1983 Berkley Books edition of his *Infamy* dealing with Major (later Colonel) Warren J. Clear, head of US Army Intelligence in the Far East, there were observations leading one to conclude that US Army Intelligence was anything but ignorant about what was going on in Japan in the fall of 1941. But nothing was said about how information was being gathered, which brings up something more substantial relative to Col. Clear.

In 1968 an amateur cryptologist enthusiast, David Kahn, published a widely-circulated book titled *The Code Breakers*, which included material about Pearl. Editors assumed that he was an expert. In a piece published more than a dozen years later, Kahn made the flat-out statement, "The United States had no spies in Japan." When this article was reprinted in the *San Francisco Chronicle* of Dec. 7, 1981, it prompted a retired US Army Colonel, John W. Carrothers, to write in denunciation of this as one of the "damn lies" the paper had printed on Pearl that day. In the conclusion of his letter to the editor, published Dec. 11, 1981, Carrothers went on to report on an address he had heard Col. Clear deliver to "900 officers at the Command and General Staff School," which concluded with the following words by Clear:

> I had an excellent organization in Japan. It consisted largely of Koreans, who hated the Japanese because Japan was then occupying their country. Regarding the Japanese army which invaded the Philippines, I knew the designations and strengths of the units, the names of the ships on which they were to sail, the dates of departure, the names of the ports of destination in the Philippines. All of this information was on President Roosevelt's desk 48 hours before the attack on Pearl Harbor.

In mulling over this declaration there has been a revisionist assumption that if US Army Intelligence had a full detailed report on the Japanese Navy task force which had departed for the Philippines, was it not logical to conclude that the same Korean dock-worker spies had also furnished the details on the Hawaii-bound fleet that had sailed out a few days earlier? Perhaps this might have been taken up in the book Col. Clear was writing about Pearl Harbor (Toland gives the title as *Pearl Harbor: The Price of Perfidy*), but it was never published and the manuscript disappeared after the demise of the author in 1980). This was the fate of another Pearl Harbor book that never saw print, produced by US Navy (Ret.) Commander Charles C. Hiles. It also vanished after its author's death. From what had been said about them informally, the Clear and Hiles books "contained dynamite," as the expression goes. So the situation remains a conflict between the will to believe, encouraged by books such as that by Atty. Clausen, as against the desire and determination to find out, as reflected by the ongoing search by revisionists.

— J. J. M.

rant Officer Ralph T. Briggs, who was responsible for getting the copy to Capt. Safford. (It was Safford who was responsible for keeping the role of Briggs concealed and thus saving his career from destruction.) This is gone over repeatedly by Toland in his book *Infamy.*

It was amazing how quickly attention to this was jettisoned after the publication of the substance of the Briggs interview by the Establishment *American Committee on the History of the Second World War* in its Newsletter No. 24, which appeared about Christmas of 1980. And one ought to re-read the solid tribute to Capt. Safford by Percy Greaves in *The Journal of Historical Review*, vol. 4, no. 4 (Winter 1983–84).

But it is not just revisionists who have clawed Atty. Clausen. Even the olympian-based Mrs. Wohlstetter, whose 1962 book was the bible on Pearl in Establishment Academe, scorned Clausen, describing his 1945 Report as "notoriously unreliable" (Wohlstetter, p. 35). Clausen's chief supporter among Establishment authors of major works on Pearl was Ladislas Farago in *The Broken Seal* (1967, p. 416) who praised it and him without any reservation.

The title of the book, *Pearl Harbor: Final Judgement*, is both preposterous and insulting if not laughable. It is the last work on the Pearl Harbor drama about like yesterday's sunset was the culmination of the world. It sounds like the similar pontifical titles of the glosses on the work of Gordon Prange by the team of Profs. Goldstein and Dillon; "The Verdict of History," indeed. (On Prange's shortcomings as a historian one should consult the critique by Capt. Roger Pineau, USN (Ret.) which covers more than an entire page in the *Christian Science Monitor* of Dec. 7, 1982). No number of works with absurd and arrogant titles alleging to be the "verdict of history," the "final judgement," and the like will ever stem Pearl Harbor revisionists from coursing the trail to the White House in the fall of 1941, instead of to the armed forces commanders at Hawaii, who were under direct orders of the civilian and armed forces quintet in Washington headed by the President.

It would be the epitome of softness to label Atty. Clausen's operation, a 55,000 mile trip around the world at taxpayers' expense at the direction of, and for the benefit of only one man, Secretary of War Henry L. Stimson, "one sided." In seeking to vindicate his revered chief's evasion of responsibility while choosing the deplorable ploy of passing on the buck to subordinates, Clausen performed mightily. His sweet and deodorized treatment of Sec. Stimson through this report is, however, in near polar opposition to, for example, the civilized dismantlement of Stimson by Prof. Current in the book mentioned above. (Commenting on Clausen's boast of having interviewed 92 persons in the course of his investigation, and including quotations from 50 of them in his report, Greaves remarked in *Perpetual War*, p. 434: "But there was no word as to what he learned from the other forty-two.") One would think from Clausen's skewed myopic view of it all that absolutely nothing happened between 1945 and 1992.

Japanese May Strike Over Weekend!

The Honolulu Advertiser — FINAL EDITION

KURUSU BLUNTLY WARNED NATION READY FOR BATTLE

Mexican Cop Says Torrance

Leaders Call Troops Back In Singapore

Will Santa Fit The Plane?

Nazis Clamp Curfew Over Montmartre

Foreign Affairs Expert Attacks

"Japanese May Strike Over Weekend!" announces a front-page headline in a leading Hawaii daily paper, *The Honolulu Advertiser*, Sunday, Nov. 30, 1941, one week before the Pearl Harbor attack.

Nevertheless, this effort a near half-century after to capitalize on it all does not clear the contemporary record. Greaves, in *Perpetual War* (pp. 433–39) characterized Clausen's odyssey as probably the greatest whitewash job ever essayed upon in history, while Morgenstern in *Pearl Harbor* (p. 200), written in 1946, concluded that if there was a single person in the USA primarily responsible for there being a thick miasmic cloud of utter irrelevancy making it impossible to sort out the Pearl Harbor story because of his numerous false leads and pointless wild goose chases, it was Henry C. Clausen. (On Sec. Stimson's integral Big Money ties one should consult Ferdinand Lundberg, *America's 60 Families* [New York: Vanguard, 1937]. Though a failed candidate for high office in 1910 and a one-time district attorney, Mr. Stimson was essentially always a Wall Street lawyer, equally at home in the cabinets of Presidents both Republican and Democrat.)

Henry C. Clausen spent well over a generation tending to the legal affairs of the Scottish Rite Masonic order, in which he became a Sovereign Grand Commander and honored by the designation "Illustrious." Turning to the subject of theology in the 1970s he produced a work titled *Clausen's Commentaries on Morals and Dogma*, which before the end of that decade sold almost a quarter of a million copies and surely has pushed toward the half-million mark since. It was first published under the authority of the Supreme Council of the Scottish Rite in San Diego in 1974. In view of his substantial reputation among his Masonic confreres in this area of endeavor, it is probably unfortunate that Atty. Clausen did not stick to theology instead of participating in a recycling of his role in the Pearl Harbor smokescreen.

Keynes: Revisionist Thinker

John Maynard Keynes: The Economist as Savior — 1920–1937, by Robert Skidelsky. New York: Viking Penguin, 1994. 731 pages. $37.50. ISBN 0-713-99110-0 (v. 2).

Reviewed by Andrew Gray

This is the second in the three-volume biography that promises to be one of the most intriguing and suggestive of our time. Lord Keynes, of course, deserves no less. Seldom has an intellect challenged accepted beliefs or traditional wisdom with deeper skepticism or vaster results. He was, in other words, a revisionist par excellence.

The first volume carried us through the writing of *The Economic Consequences of the Peace* — that indictment of the Versailles Treaty which reads as freshly today as when first penned, and which made the author world-famous. This book takes us through the writing of *The General Theory of Employment, Interest, and Money*, which changed the nature of "the dismal science." It concludes with the heart attack in 1937 that presaged a relatively early death but left time for the monumental achievement at Bretton Woods in 1944 — the design and eventual establishment of a workable world monetary order.

The author, now Lord Skidelsky, adores his subject. And why not? In what other individual in this century had such a panoply of gifts been united under one brow? And such a civilized man (though not always civil) — so convivial, so witty, so trenchant. The only trouble, from Lord Skidelsky's standpoint, is that Keynes was also strongly pro-German. For this he had not been easily forgiven — either within the economics profession or outside it — and this aspect of his life and character is resolutely downplayed in this book.

Keynes sympathized with the German cause and predicament in the aftermath of World War I. This was revisionism in the grand manner, and with many parallels to the revisionism of own time. Compare, for example, the war reparations claims of France and England (and the other Allies, too) of the 1920s with the "Holocaust" claims of recent decades. Much of what Keynes had to say about the former applies to the latter just as well. There was a reparations "industry," as well, with many income streams at stake and an attendant unwillingness to consider the harmful consequences of such continuous extortion. Keynes accused Allied statesmen and bankers of willful self-delusion, self-dealing, and propagandistic excess. It all has a familiar ring.

Actually, economists have widely admitted that



Keynes in the 1930s.

Adolf Hitler was himself an unwitting Keynesian and even anticipated several doctrines of the *The General Theory* (first published in 1936). "Liquidity preference" and "marginal utility" were not concepts for which the Führer had precise German equivalents, but he well understood the "money illusion" and the practical remedies required when "effective demand" produced "equilibrium" at less than full employment. The extent to which Hitler employed actual Keynesian arguments in his attacks upon the Young Plan and the entire reparations system of the 1920s is an open question, as we lack transcripts of most of his speeches from these transitional years. It is more than likely, however, that the two men were saying much the same thing on the subject and at the same time. Lord Skidelsky regrettably does not go into all this.

Keynes himself underscored his sympathy for things German, and his awareness that the economic policies of the early National Socialist years were largely a prefiguration of his own doctrines, by contributing a special preface to a 1930s German edition of *The General Theory*. Skidelsky chooses not to go into this matter in any significant detail, but certainly not from lack of appreciation of its implicit import. He is, after all, the author of workmanlike and not unsympathetic 1975 biography of Sir Oswald Mosley, and has published widely on the subject of British fascism (a questionable but inevi-

Andrew Gray, a writer and translator, is former office director in the US Department of Commerce. He lives in Washington, DC.

table term).

Not that Keynes himself had personal sympathy for National Socialism, though he may have admired its "animal spirits." Nor was he anti-Semitic in any significant sense. The unease he causes today on this subject stems from the fact that he was also not specifically pro-Semitic. (Philosemitism seems to be a requirement in the economics profession these days.)

Much of the charm of this volume is rooted in the wholly improbable marriage of Keynes to a Russian ballerina, Lydia Lopokova. She steals the literary show much of the time with her muscovite English (such as her description of the Sitwell family as suffering from "undeveloped arrestedness"). An accomplished actress as well as dancer, she was up to her husband in a palpable but indefinable way — perhaps even in the manner of Cosima Wagner.

Germany's Place in Post-Postwar Europe

In Europe's Name: Germany and the Divided Continent, by Timothy Garton Ash. New York: Random House, 1993. 680 pages. $27.50. ISBN 0-394-55711-5.

Reviewed by Andrew Gray

"*Ende gut, alles gut*" ("All's well that end's well"). What more can one say of the tortuous decades that led to German unification. A lot, of course, and Timothy Garton Ash says it well. The British, it is often alleged, are born with a good prose style, best exemplified in this instance by a lightness of tone in just those moments when ponderousness might be expected. Here he is describing the effect of the conciliatory gestures made by Chancellor Kohl toward the Honecker regime during the mid-1980s:

Flattered and reassured, Honecker did not, as intended, relax his grip on his subjects in the GDR. In fact, he tightened it, but he did relax his grip on reality. West German illusions about East Germany reinforced his own, thus contributing to hubris, followed by nemesis. Hence our ultimate paradox of West German policy towards the GDR: they got it right because they got it wrong!

But this is an establishment book, funded by the Ford Foundation, fostered by the Woodrow Wilson International Center, vetted by the likes of Fritz Stern, and sponsored by the author's Oxford Colleague, Ralf Dahrendorf. It thus boils down to a defense of the existing Oder-Neisse line as Germany's eastern border. The difficulty is that this really cannot be done except by resort to enormous and persistent lies. For one thing, Mr. Ash, like most of his cohorts, simply cannot bring himself to consider the expulsion of Germans from East Prussia, Pomerania, Silesia, and the Sudetenland as a crime. No, these territories are to be considered as having been "gambled away." This is the establishment view, and enforced by propaganda of much less subtle nature than this scholarly book provides. That this expulsion of millions represented in historical fact the most massive crime in the annals of the Second World War and its aftermath is what the establishment cannot face, and of course it needs the Holocaust mythology all the more desperately to sustain the self-delusion.

Thus there is a reciprocal relationship between the persecution of revisionists in Germany (and elsewhere) and the insistence that no atonement is owed to the victims (and their assigns) of the expulsion. Can this viewpoint be defended in perpetuity, as Mr. Ash so devoutly wishes? The merest glance at a map of reunified Germany suggests the improbability of such mass historical hypnosis continuing to prevail. After all, Stettin (Szczecin) is virtually next door to Berlin, and the Oder river traffic, if it is to be restored at all, will be largely German or German-controlled. (In 1914 Stettin handled more than four million tons of barge cargo traffic, nearly all of it German.) In 1945 it was evidently thought Stettin would become a significant outlet for the imports and exports of the Upper Silesian industrial complex. Under Polish aegis, this complex today can scarcely produce a bedpan, let alone any merchandise competitive on world markets.

Yet typically, Mr. Ash ends his book with a plea to Germans to be reasonable and to acquire "the new habit of not fully exerting the power they had." Of course he doesn't dream of appealing to the Poles or anyone else to be similarly reasonable.

This is not a good time to be in the business of publishing maps and atlases. Perhaps if this could be done in loose-leaf form it would be less risky. Mr. Ash signifies his awareness of these vagaries by appending a series of six maps to his book, among which the current one already promises to be the most evanescent. But he ventures no predictions. The establishment experts have been taught a lesson.

Political language — and with variations this is true of all political parties, from Conservatives to Anarchists — is designed to make lies sound truthful and murder acceptable, and to give an appearance of solidarity to pure wind.

— George Orwell

A Story of Revenge That Needs Telling

Just BANNED in Germany!
Thousands of Copies of this "Dangerous" Work Destroyed

". . . Extremely gripping and compelling account of the appalling events which accompanied the end of the war and the expulsion of the Germans from what was to become Western Poland in one go. . . . The topic of Jewish participation in these acts of oppression is controversial. . . but I am satisfied that the author is a serious researcher. . . . The book is in fact a major contribution to our understanding."

—ANTONY POLONSKY,
Professor of East European Jewish History,
Brandeis University

An Eye for an Eye: The Untold Story of Jewish Revenge Against Germans in 1945 is a riveting account of terrible but little-known events that followed the end of World War II.

In 1945 the Soviet Union, which occupied Poland and parts of Germany — a region inhabited by ten million German civilians — established its Office of State Security and deliberately recruited Jews to carry out its own trademark brand of de-Nazification. The Office's hirelings raided German homes, rounding up men, women, and children — 99 percent of them noncombatant, innocent civilians — and incarcerated them in cellars, prisons, and 1,255 concentration camps, where inmates subsisted on starvation rations, and where typhus ran rampant and torture was commonplace. In this brief period, between 60,000 and 80,000 Germans died while in the hands of the Office.



This book tells the story of how the Jewish victims of the Third Reich's policies turned around and inflicted equally terrible suffering on innocent Germans. Author John Sack focuses on people like Lola, a young woman who became commandant of a prison, determined to avenge the death of her family, and Shlomo, a commandant who bragged that "What the Germans couldn't do in five years at Auschwitz, I've done in five months at Schwientochlowitz."

This is the first book to tell the story of Jewish atrocities against German civilians. To unearth it, the author, a veteran journalist and war correspondent, spent seven years conducting research and interviews in Poland, Germany, Israel, and the United States.

AN EYE FOR AN EYE

The Untold Story of Jewish Revenge Against the Germans in 1945

Hardbound · 252 pages · Notes · Sources · Index · $25.95 postpaid

Institute for Historical Review · PO Box 2739 · Newport Beach, CA 92659

Letters

Emotions Recalled

After finishing your book *Innocent at Dachau* [by Joseph Halow], which I found on the "new book shelf" of the downtown Beaumont Public Library, I wanted to write to you to show my appreciation for your effort. What you have done in this book is important.

I, too, was in the armed forces during World War II (US Naval Reserve, April 1943-July 1946) at a relatively young age, and I have vivid recollections of the precedent-setting trials from 1946 onward. I recall, too, the emotions of the time. But even then, my emotional reactions were to the deaths of civilians through aerial bombardment, the loss of so many lives among the troops on both sides of the conflict, and the poverty and hopelessness of the Europeans who survived.

Unfortunately, the mass of mankind seems to require myths, and the myths surrounding the coming of that war and its conduct are persistent. You have done all of us, "true believers" and skeptics (like me) alike, a service.

W. R. T.
Beaumont, Texas

Nothing Learned

As a Marine Corps veteran of the Korean war, I protest the claim that our World War II dead gave their lives in a great crusade for "freedom" and "liberty." Those young Americans did not die fighting to defend their country, but rather to further an alien, anti-Western and anti-Christian ideology. We do no honor to their memory by claiming otherwise.

"Freedom" and "liberty" were propaganda slogans for a world revolution in which the United States, the Soviet Union and the international liberal left were united as allies. The Allied victory was the beginning of America's end. Today, fifty years after the end of that terrible conflict, having lost our national sovereignty and morals, we remain as ignorant as ever. Immersed in historical lies, we have learned nothing.

Philip J. Fogarty
Santa Ana, Calif.

Eye-Opening

Please renew my *Journal* subscription for another year. I was skeptical about revisionism when I received my first issue, but the six issues that arrived during the past year have been very eye-opening, to say the least. Please keep up the excellent work.

J. P.
Duquesne, Penn.

Professional

Today I called your office to inquire about a book I had ordered. I just want to tell you that I've seldom been treated so courteously and professionally. It's no wonder the IHR attracts the supporters it does.

M. R.
Wells, Minn.

Theological Inerrancy

Holocaust historians and publicists always seem to presume that everyone must adopt an unquestioning and even reverential attitude toward the Holocaust extermination story. Their attitude is one of theological inerrancy.

M. D.
Seattle, Wash.

Qualified Support

I'd like you to know that I do not support IHR in all questions. I support IHR in its fight to show to all the world the truth regarding the Holocaust. But I do not support the IHR opinion concerning Israel, Palestinians and Arabs.

The Palestinian terrorists are indeed terrorists, and not freedom fighters. The Arabs do not want to reach peace with Israel, but are using the peace process to weaken Israel, and after this, to destroy it.

I am sending you $50 in support. More I am not able to donate. I am living on my wage, and am not a rich man.

B. H.
Jerusalem, Israel

Degrelle's Departure

I was very saddened to learn of the death of Leon Degrelle [as reported in the May-June 1994 *Journal*.] He distinguished himself in the fight against Communism, sacrificed a lot, and earned the respect of many. Another one of the world's greatest has departed.

M. H.
Hamilton, Ont.
Canada

Greetings from Poland

I am sending you the most recent issue of our magazine *Stanczyk*, in which we introduce *The Journal of Historical Review*, and discuss at length on page 82 your article [from the Winter 1989–90 *Journal*] "Simon Wiesenthal: Bogus 'Nazi Hunter'."

We are interested in contemporary historical revisionism, and plan to inform our readers about this in the future.

Tomasz Gabis, Editor
Stanczyk
Wroclaw, Poland

Be Patient

I look forward to each issue of the *Journal* with true love of history. Your extensively researched articles provide a solid foundation for the advancement of our cause — to renew truth, reestablish facts, and thus end insidious lies so that future generations will not have to suffer under imposed "politically correct" ignorance.

You deserve far more than

mere gratitude for presenting such edifying and inspirational material. Only the psychologically handicapped or overt fool could read the *Journal* and still hold on to his illusions.

It is no secret that extremely powerful institutions exist that continue to uphold lies, and which have no desire to see repressed information come to light. I therefore understand the immense burden you endure because you set forth historical truths.

Be patient. The spirit of the age is with you, and it will not be long before positive revolutionary changes take place in the United States and around the world. As the terrible Berlin wall was finally torn down, so also shall those hideous museums, and the institutions behind them, someday fall. As they have risen high with no foundation, the weight of their crash shall be great indeed.

Remember the words of probably the most controversial revisionist who ever lived, and who was subjected to such terrible persecution: "You shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." (John 8:32).

J.M.
Florence, Col.

Suppressed Hungarian History

I am an enthusiastic reader of your informative *Journal*, to which I have subscribed for more than a year. When I first received it, I did not have much time to devote to it, but now, after reading several issues, I realize the importance of the information you offer, which is unknown to most people, even to educated Americans.

I applaud the courage of your contributors, and your courage in publishing their articles and books. Hopefully the time will come when people will recognize the great danger that threatens their future.

Among the historical issues that deserve consideration and revision is the Treaty of Trianon (1920), which was imposed on vanquished Hungary by the Allied powers in the aftermath of the First World War, just as they imposed the punitive Treaty of Versailles on defeated Germany, and the Treaty of St. Germain on Austria. Although honest historians are well aware that the Treaty of Trianon was based on exaggerated facts, distorted half-truths and blatant lies, few people know anything about it.

At the time of the outbreak of the First World War in 1914, Hungary was not an independent nation, but rather part of the multi-ethnic Habsburg Austro-Hungarian Empire. Because its foreign policy was determined in Vienna, Hungary was forced into the war. When it ended in 1918, the victorious Allied powers sought to punish and weaken Austria by mutilating Hungary. With the Treaty of Trianon, a natural geographical unit and a well-established Hungarian ethnic community was carved up.

The dictated Treaty reduced Hungary to about a third of its prewar size, and put three million Hungarians (Magyars) under foreign rule. The Hungarian army was limited to 35,000 men, and reparations were imposed.

Under the pretext that Hungary had subdued and mistreated them, various ethnic minorities claimed for themselves parts of ancient Hungarian lands. They portrayed Hungarians as cruel, ruthless subjugators, who did not belong to the European community of nations.

Unfortunately for Hungary, in 1920, the Allied peacemakers did not consider the Carpathian Basin as a geographical unit, but rather looked only at certain isolated areas.

Following the outbreak of the Second World War in 1939, the Hungarian government refused permission for German troops to cross Hungary. When Poland capitulated, nearly 200,000 Polish soldiers and civilians were given refuge in Hungary.

In August 1940, the "Second Vienna Award," backed by Germany and Italy, restored to Hungary 43,104 sq.km. of territory in northern Transylvania that had been turned over to Romania in 1920.

This compromise solution satisfied neither Hungary or Rumania. Hungarians wanted the return of all of its prewar territory, including the whole of Transylvania. Romania supported the Award, and bound itself to the Third Reich, because it feared losing even more of Transylvania to Hungary if it did not.

During this period, Hungary did everything possible to avoid involvement in the Second World War, even giving up claims to her prewar territories in Yugoslavia. All the same, Hungary signed the Tripartite Pact with Germany in November 1940.

Yugoslavia's pro-German government was overthrown in a military coup in March 1941, and the new leaders prepared for war against Germany. As Hitler got ready to attack Yugoslavia, in part with Hungarian support, Hungary's Prime Minister, Pal Teleki, opposed a military alliance with Germany and sought to keep out of the conflict. He protested by committing suicide.

Not wishing to be left out of the seemingly invincible Axis alliance that struck against Soviet Russia in June 1941, Hungary wasted little time joining the German-led military campaign.

Winston Churchill, wishing to honor Teleki, promised that, at the negotiations at the end of the Second World War, an empty chair would symbolically be left for him. Reneging on this pledge, though, Britain and the other Allied powers once again punished Hungary at the end of the war.

Your readers deserve to know more about the suppressed history of Hungary during this century.

B. L.
Rochester, New York

We welcome letters from readers. We reserve the right to edit for style and space.

Back in Print in a Revised & Updated New Edition

The Zionist Terror Network

Updated & Expanded

Background & Operations of the Jewish Defense League and Other Criminal Zionist Groups


Revised and Updated Edition
THE ZIONIST TERROR NETWORK
Background and Operation of the Jewish Defense League and other Criminal Zionist Groups
A Special Report
This booklet documents the background and criminal activities of Jewish Zionist terrorist groups, and especially the Jewish Defense League. Particular emphasis is given here to terror – including murder – against "thought criminals" who question the Holocaust extermination story.
Zionist terrorists openly proclaim an arrogant Jewish-supremacist ideology and acknowledge their readiness to use violence against those who disagree with them. With a well-documented record of bigotry and crime, they pose a serious danger to our society, and to men and women everywhere who treasure freedom.
Institute for Historical Review

Racism, Bigotry, Hate Crimes, Incitement to Violence, Terrorism — You *Can't* Be Talking About *Jewish* Agendas?!

If you want to believe the media, most of the "hate crimes" committed in the U.S. and elsewhere are the product of "right-wing extremism," with the victims often Jews.

But what are the facts?

Now the Institute for Historical Review has issued — as a public service — a completely revised and updated edition of the first, and still only, comprehensive dossier on Zionist-style racism, bigotry and terrorism.

This special report constitutes a high-level intelligence briefing on the best available information. What it reveals will shock and anger you, but it will supply you with the hard facts and documentation you need to fight back against this spiraling cycle of unparalleled violence whose network of bloodshed extends from Tel Aviv to California.

This is a vital briefing for Revisionists and for anyone interested in the face of Zionist terror in today's world. An enormous amount of quality research went into the making of this fully-referenced document, which includes a 1971-onward chronicle of terrorist acts — bombing, maiming, and even murder — carried out by the JDL, its offshoots, and other Zionist hate groups.

The Zionist Terror Network

Prepared and published by Institute for Historical Review
20 pages • Large 8½ x 11 format • Photos • Notes
$4 each • 2-5 copies $3.50 each • 6 or more copies $3 each, postpaid

Institute for Historical Review
Post Office Box 2739 • Newport Beach, California 92659

The Most Ambitious Book-length Debunking to Date of the Works of Jean-Claude Pressac

AUSCHWITZ
The End of a Legend

by Carlo Mattogno

Mattogno is a learned man in the mold of his ancestors of the Renaissance. He is meticulous and prolific . . . in the first rank of Revisionists.

—Prof. Robert Faurisson

Jean-Claude Pressac's *Auschwitz: Technique and Operation of the Gas Chambers* was published in 1989 to resounding worldwide media hosannas. It was followed in 1993 by his second opus, *The Crematoria of Auschwitz: The Machinery of Mass Killing*.

Pressac's principal volume, more than 500 pages with hundreds of illustrations, promised conclusive evidence of the existence and use of homicidal gas chambers at Auschwitz. Headlines proclaimed that the revisionists were finally vanquished, that Pressac had proven what the immense resources of the Holocaust industry had failed to prove in more than 40 years.

But in the mad rush to herald the news, the pundits hadn't bothered to *read* the book, presuming that the French pharmacist had accomplished what his publisher–the Klarsfeld Foundation–claimed he had. He hadn't.

So Pressac's second volume was published, promising, in his own words, "*the definitive rebuttal of revisionist theories*." This dog wouldn't hunt, either.

As you read ***Auschwitz: The End of a Legend*** you'll find out why. Here, Italian documents specialist Carlo Mattogno demolishes the boldest attempt to date– Pressac's back to back volumes–to answer the revisionist critique of the Auschwitz extermination story.

Mattogno shows how Pressac misinterpreted his own data in such a way as to assist not his fellow exterminationists, but the very revisionists he had set out defeat.

Mattogno demonstrates that Pressac's confused arguments confirm his ignorance of the structure and functioning of crematory ovens and gas chambers, and of the nature and use of the disinfectant Zyklon B; that Pressac's use of available statistics was arbitrary and largely fanciful, resulting in a *down-sizing* of the number of alleged victims; and that where information did not exist, Pressac simply invented it, often with mutually contradictory arguments in different parts of his thesis.

Mattogno's relentless deconstruction of Pressac's assertions and interpretations not only reveals the Holocaust Lobby hero's incompetence, it's a case study of the pathetic sloppiness the media can be counted on to overlook in the crusade against Holocaust Revisionism.



AUSCHWITZ: The End of a Legend
Softcover • 150 pp. • index • illustrated
$12.95 + $2 postage

—Published by—
Institute for Historical Review
P.O. Box 2739 • Newport Beach, CA 92659